DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 755 LI 004 475

TITLE	Title II Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Public Law 89-10) as Amended. Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1972, School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials.
INSTITUTION	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	DHEW-OE-73-21103
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	71p.; (1 reference)
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 ($0.65)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Annual Reports; Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; *Instructional Materials; *Library Acquisition; Library Collections; Library Materials; Reading Programs; *School Libraries
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; ESEA Title II; Right To Read

ABSTRACT

Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 (Public Law 89-10) as amended, provides direct Federal assistance for the acquisition of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools. Its purpose is to improve learning and teaching by making available high quality instructional materials to pupils and their teachers. This report is a synthesis of the ESEA title II fiscal year 1972 narrative reports submitted by each state department of education to the U.S. Office of Education. The examples from states cited to illustrate the various topics covered by the report are arranged by geographic region. The topics are: State management of ESEA Title II Program; Program development; Title II's commitment to the Right to Read program; Services to private school children and teachers; Evaluation and dissemination; and, Needs. The report has evidence that materials made available under title II contributed to a great extent to innovations in instruction and to flexibility in meeting the needs of children and teachers in the process of education. (Author/SJ)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 082755

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DHEW Publication Number (OE) 73-21103

ANNUAL REPORT

FISCAL YEAR 1972

TITLE II

ELEMENTARY

AND SECONDARY

EDUCATION ACT
(Public Law 89-10)
as amended

SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES, TEXTBOOKS, AND OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Caspar W. Weinberger, Secretary

Education Division
S. P. Marland, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Education

Office of Education
John R. Ottina, Commissioner-designate

LI 004 475

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1973

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 – Price $

School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials
Title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Public Law 89-10)
as amended

Fiscal Year 1972
Annual Report
Preface

Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10) as amended, provides direct Federal assistance for the acquisition of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools. Its purpose is to improve learning and teaching by making available high quality instructional materials to pupils and their teachers.

Up to three percent of the appropriations was set aside for allotment among American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Virgin Islands, the Department of the Interior for children and teachers in schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Department of Defense for children and teachers in overseas dependents' schools.

The balance of the appropriations was apportioned among the States and the District of Columbia on the basis of the number of children enrolled in public and private schools in each State in proportion to the national total of such children. States operate their programs under title II on the basis of State plans approved by the Commissioner of Education. State plans include assurances of: administration of the program under relative need and selection criteria; equitable treatment of the private sector; maintenance of effort.

The authorizations and appropriations of the program up to and including fiscal year 1972 are as follows:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$100,000,000	$100,000,000
1967	125,000,000	102,000,000
1968	150,000,000	99,200,000
1969	162,500,000	50,000,000
1970	200,000,000	42,500,000
1971	200,000,000	80,000,000
1972	210,000,000	90,000,000

In the U.S. Office of Education, title II was administered during fiscal year 1973 in the Bureau of Libraries and Learning Resources. For program administration, States and other participating areas were divided into five regions of the United States as follows:

Northeast — Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont.

Southeast	Alabama, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands.
Upper Midwest	Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin.
Mid-Continent	Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Louisiana, Montana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah, Wyoming.
Western	Alaska, Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, American Samoa, Guam, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

This report is a synthesis of the ESEA title II fiscal year 1972 Narrative Reports submitted by each State Department of Education to the U.S. Office of Education. The examples from States cited to illustrate the various topics covered by the report are arranged in order by the geographic regions - Northeast, Southeast, Upper Midwest, Mid-Continent, Western.

The report has evidence that materials made available under title II contributed to a great extent to innovations in instruction and to flexibility in meeting the needs of children and teachers in the process of education.

Contents

		Page
Preface		iii
I.	State Management of the ESEA Title II Program	1
II.	Program Development	9
III.	Title II's Commitment to Right to Read	25
IV.	Services to Private School Children and Teachers	28
V.	Evaluation and Dissemination	31
VI.	Needs	51
	Tables	58
1.	Funds Available and Funds Expended for Acquisition and State Administration and Percent of Total Expended for Administration Under ESEA Title II, by State or Outlying Area, Fiscal Year 1972	59
2.	Funds Available and Funds Expended for State Administration and for Acquisitions Under ESEA Title II Programs: Fiscal Years 1966-71	60
3.	Cost of State Administration Under ESEA Title II, by Object of Expenditure and State or Outlying Area, Fiscal Year 1972	61
4.	Number of State Department of Education Personnel Assigned to ESEA Title II in Fulltime Equivalents, Fiscal Year 1972, by State or Outlying Area	62
5.	Cost of School Library Resources, Other Instructional Materials, and Textbooks Loaned to Children and Teachers; Costs of Ordering, Cataloging, Processing, and Delivering Materials, and Percent of Total Acquisitions Expended in Each Category; Under ESEA Title II, Fiscal Year 1972	63
6.	Cost of Library Books, Periodicals, Other Printed Materials, and Audiovisual Materials Loaned to Children and Teachers as School Library Resources, Under ESEA Title II, Fiscal Year 1972, and Percent of Total for Each Type of Material, by State or Outlying Area	64

Page

7. Cost of Trade Books, Periodicals, Other Printed Materials, and Audiovisual Materials Loaned to Children and Teachers as Other Instructional Materials Under ESEA Title II, Fiscal Year 1972, and Percent of Total for Each Type of Material, by State or Outlying Area. 65

8. Funds Expended for Trade Books, Periodicals and Other Printed Materials, Textbooks, and Audiovisual Materials Under ESEA Title II, Fiscal Year 1966-72 66

I. State Management of the ESEA Title II Program

1. Inclusion of ESEA Title II in Comprehensive Planning

The new State plans which were developed in fiscal year 1971 by State departments of education for the administration of title II continued in use in fiscal year 1972. These plans have stimulated use of a management by objectives system for program administration which requires needs assessment, development of goals and objectives, formulation of a performance plan, and evaluation. The plans are useful in assisting States to chart a course toward achieving title II objectives, as well as overall State objectives for school media programs.

A number of staff members assigned to the administration of title II are now involved in State-wide planning for education. In Vermont, the State media consultant who also serves as title II coordinator, is involved in comprehensive planning for Federal program administration. The chief concern in fiscal year 1972 was formulation of single application and reporting forms to simplify local education agency participation in Federal programs. A similar project was begun in Delaware through the establishment of a Federal Programs Task Force.

Twelve States of the Southeast report planning for ESEA title II by the top level planning unit as a part of the total comprehensive program for education. Title II staff members in Alabama and Maryland were involved in department-wide studies (by the American Management Association) of management activities of all facets of responsibilities in implementing department-wide goals. In Virginia, the main thrust of State education agency planning is currently centered around the Standards of Quality required by the new Virginia Constitution which was effective July 1, 1971. Also, ESEA title II personnel are involved in comprehensive district or regional planning as it relates to over-all State goals and objectives. In Florida all program activities undertaken by the Department, including title II, are projected, under comprehensive State planning, over a six year period. Objectives are examined closely and revised each year. Program needs are reviewed in terms of personnel and other resource requirements. In addition to State agency efforts in the area of planning, each school district within the State of Florida is required by law to develop a comprehensive district plan each year. The title II coordinator is involved in assisting the districts in developing plans which relate to both State and local priorities, including media programs.

In South Carolina assigned responsibilities for carrying out title II objectives broadened greatly in fiscal year 1972. The media and library consultants have since the beginning of the program been directly involved in all title II activities. The new project format in South Carolina involved subject area supervisors from the Elementary Division, the Secondary Division, and the Curriculum Division, since it was expressly designed to provide the specialized instructional activities for clearly defined groups of children who indicated a measurable need for a special program.

Comprehensive State agency planning in many Upper Midwest States has been assigned to newly formed divisions for planning, research and evaluation. This new type of division often initiates an introspective study and analysis of what is currently being done in each section of the State education agency, what should be done and what are the best approaches to making necessary changes. The Missouri and Wisconsin State education agencies are among the States that have completed self-studies and are making such changes as: adding staff, arranging for more adequate office space and coordinating monitoring and data gathering activities across division lines (resulting in team visits and fewer questionnaires for school districts).

These newly-formed divisions also assisted the ESEA II program personnel in making program goals and objectives do retail with the overall State education agency goals and often the State or Governor's priorities. Indiana and Minnesota with such assistance were able to augment each State's commitment to the Right to Read.

Louisiana included title II in its comprehensive planning through the Planning and Evaluation unit. Personnel from all divisions and agencies of the State agency worked to formulate division goals which related to the goals of Louisiana education.

In California, the comprehensive plan developed during fiscal year 1971 by the State education agency was further refined to come closer to the needs of the Federal programs for which it was designed to be a consolidated application form. This revised form will be required for all local education agencies during fiscal year 1973 for all title II applications, although additional information will be required from all local education agencies in order to comply with the California State Plan. Increasing efforts are being made by the State ESEA title II staff to encourage local education agencies to plan media programs with effective coordination of funding sources, both Federal and local. Assessment of needs has been stressed in order to coordinate programs and funding sources to the best effect.

The ten priorities identified by the Oregon Board of Education determine the direction of all programs within the State agency. Five of these priorities are instruction related:

1. Primary education development
2. Improvement of education for the disadvantaged
3. Adding the fourth "R" - responsibility
4. Career education development
5. Extension of educational opportunity

The improvement of education in these priority areas requires a carefully selected collection of instructional materials in all Oregon schools. The area of reading competence has been identified as the major component to achieve the priorities listed above. Consistency with State policy mandates that title II projects reflect a plan to improve reading ability through the selection of appropriate materials of hign quality for use in the priority areas.

Beginning October 1, 1971, ESEA title II became one of the categorical aid programs under the administrative authority of the newly developed Grants Management Section (GM) of the Washington State education agency's Division of Curriculum and Instruction. This new arrangement was the result of wide participation by staff and management in a series of planning sessions aimed at identification of the role of each program within the agency. Stress was placed on coordinating the operations of ESEA title II and other programs within GM, including ESEA title I, title I - Migrant, ESEA title III, and NDEA title III-A, with Johnson O'Malley and the State programs for the Gifted and the Urban, Rural, Racial, and Disadvantaged (URRD). One objective of the closer program coordination was concentration of resources on critical educational needs. The entire planning structure for the title II program was integrated with the goals of the Division of Curriculum and Instruction. School districts were encouraged to set goals and objectives for their title II programs after carefully assessing their needs. National and State priorities, as listed in the third revision of the ESEA title III Assessment of Needs for Students in Washington State were included in the special-purpose application forms in order that school districts could use them as a basis for planning their title II program for the year.

2. Relative Need Changes

One of the major requirements in the administration of the title II program is the distribution of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials among eligible children and teachers according to relative need. Criteria for relative need are established on the basis of a comparative analysis and the application of standards for instructional materials. Data needed to establish relative need are obtained from surveys of schools and school districts on instructional materials available to children and teachers.

Criteria applied in deciding relative need are reviewed from time to time by State department of education personnel and adjusted to changing needs in the States. Few changes in relative need formulas were reported, however, for fiscal year 1972, although several States did report minor changes in the percentage of program funds intended to support projects to meet the requirements of children and teachers in special instructional programs or priorities given to various areas of the curriculum or target groups of children. New Hampshire made a slight increase in the percentage of funds for special-purpose grants giving emphasis to reading; New York continued to fund projects in reading but also reported higher priority for projects in drug education and environmental/ecological education.

A top priority of the Alabama Department of Education is to accredit all elementary schools. The relative need criteria and formula for title II have been revised to assist schools in reaching this goal by assigning priority I classifications to elementary schools which do not meet State standards for school libraries. Special purpose grants will be limited to the 145 elementary schools which do not have centralized libraries. Funds will be used to assist these schools with their collections provided they will agree to set aside a minimum of one classroom and employ clerical personnel for cataloging and

processing. Maryland's revised State plan stipulates that title II funds available will be spent to provide materials related to the educational priorities identified by the State and local school systems: improvement in reading, increased understanding of people of different ethnic or racial backgrounds, early childhood education, drug awareness, and family living. North Carolina, in implementing its Project Media for the second year, reflected USOE priorities, State Department of Education emphases, and local needs. South Carolina's new formula has two sections. Section A applies to basic school library resources while Section B includes other printed and published instructional materials necessary to promote activities designed to meet three critical need areas:

Improving achievement in the basic skills of reading and mathematics
Reducing the dropout rate
Reducing first grade failures

Tennessee's decision to use a small portion of program funds for the first time for special projects designed to meet specific curriculum needs met with an enthusiastic response on the part of localities.

During fiscal year 1972 West Virginia refined its relative need formula so that money was allocated both to and within school districts based on a current needs survey. The new formula eliminates the provision which allowed for limited purchase of textbooks and other instructional materials. Puerto Rico made a change which resulted in a larger percentage of funds being spent for audiovisual materials.

Michigan reflects the stance taken by nine of the Upper Midwest States in the following statements--"A study was made during fiscal year 1972 for changes needed in the relative need formula or criteria. The decision to make no changes for fiscal year 1973 was based on consideration that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act expires June 30, 1973 and that it would be best to wait until we see the ramifications of the new law before making major changes." The State of Kansas continued to emphasize development of elementary library media centers by doubling the relative need formula for funding centers newly established for which a certified library media specialist was provided. That person must serve a minimum .3 full-time equivalency and must have fifteen semester hours of library and audiovisual training. Wisconsin adjusted its relative need formula to reflect economic need, local effort, present media collection in relation to State standards and utilization of materials (degree to which school facilitates the use by students and teachers of media materials and services).

Missouri amended its State Plan to focus special needs projects on reading improvement. Three types of special needs projects were: unmet special needs in innovative reading projects approved under other Federally funded programs; in existing programs for developmental reading in schools that have made special efforts to improve reading instruction; and special reading classes for the blind, emotionally disturbed, partially sighted, and gifted. In fiscal year 1972, 45,309 pupils in 91 schools participated in special needs program.

In Arkansas, changes were made to give more help to areas where need is more evident after a study indicated that the need for library materials is greatest in school districts with lower assessed valuations.

The relative need formula in Colorado was adjusted to give priority to making resources available that would help create student desire to read and eliminate reading failure.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs revised its system of relative need allocation to use the following criteria:

1. Scarcity of library resources in the school.
2. Remoteness of the school from central library resources.
3. Implementation of a new curriculum or a special program in a school or all the schools of an area or subagency requiring supplementary school library resources to fulfill the project objectives.
4. Need for school library resources for physically, mentally, or emotionally handicapped children.
5. Need for school library resources for bilingual children.

One or more of the criteria are applied in fund allocation and project application approval. Although schools in all BIA Areas are represented, projects showing the greatest need and the highest potential impact are assigned priority.

In Arizona, State ESEA title II staff and the members of their Advisory Board made changes in the relative need criteria and formula for allocation. Basic grants per school were increased to $350 and $450, kindergarten enrollment was included in attendance figures, since State aid is now provided for those children, and print and nonprint holdings of each school are rated separately rather than together to determine need on a three-point scale.

3. Use of Advisory Committees

Many States have established advisory committees to assist with the development and revision of administrative policies concerned with the title II program. The composition of the committees usually includes school media specialists, teachers, administrators, supervisors, representatives of professional organizations and media education programs, private school personnel, and private citizens. Committees have assisted in the development and revision of standards, formulation of relative need criteria for the distribution of instructional materials, setting policy, and have been very useful in the dissemination of information about the program.

In New Jersey, a subcommittee of the title II advisory committee has been particularly active in connection with the special-purpose grant phase of the title II program. The group developed criteria for use in selecting the schools to receive the grants and assisted in making the final selections so as to have the schools geographically distributed throughout the State and, represent urban, suburban, and rural schools with media programs at beginning, developing, and advanced stages of progress.

The title II advisory committee in Delaware also gave special attention in 1972 to the relative need formula. After studying statistical data collected on school media collections in local schools, the committee decided to continue with the same formula; however, on the basis of need, the committee recommended that special-purpose grants be directed in 1972 to serve the handicapped children enrolled in State and private institutions and children assigned to State correctional institutions.

North Carolina's Advisory Committee assisted the State staff in reviewing Project Media (special grant) applications and making recommendations for funding and by consulting with representatives from the 19 local education agencies and two regional centers participating in Project Media. The twenty-one member advisory committee was composed of classroom teachers and school media specialists, library and audiovisual supervisors, curriculum and instructional supervisors, library science and audiovisual educators, administrators from public and private schools and colleges, public and State library staff members, and Department of Education staff.

Additional support in the administration of title II came from the State advisory councils. The Iowa Advisory Council formed sub-committees to study: the loan periods, weeding practices and ratio between print and non-print, the allocation formula, and special purpose grants. Ohio managed to combine the advisory committees for ESEA II and NDEA III, a factor strengthening their coordination. A sub-committee of the Illinois Right to Read Advisory Committee made the final selection of 28 special purpose reading related projects funded under ESEA II.

During fiscal year 1972, the Washington State Title II Advisory Committee met four times to assist in program development, including an assessment of the relative need criteria and formula developed by the State agency in order to help the title II program to meet new needs and/or priorities. The Committee's name was changed to the Washington State Learning Resources Advisory Committee in order to reflect more accurately its concern with coordinating title II with other programs, particularly NDEA title III-A.

Besides advising on relative need, the Arizona ESEA Title II Advisory Board recommended some changes in application forms and distribution procedures, and reviewed and ranked special purpose title II Right to Read project applications.

A National Advisory Committee was established by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Its concerns encompassed all matters pertaining to the Bureau's school libraries, in addition to ESEA title II. The Committee conducted a survey of print and nonprint resources in BIA schools to measure how nearly they reach ALA 1969 standards. Results of the survey will also be used as one measure of need for title II fund allocation purposes. The Committee set up a procedure for reviewing and evaluating audiovisual materials about Indians which will be made available to all BIA schools. The following documents were developed by the Committee:

Media review guide
Guidelines for selecting materials

Basic standards for Indian collections
Handbook for BIA school librarians
Bibliographies of materials

The Hawaii Superintendent of Education appointed a new ESEA Title II Advisory Committee which met for the first time in March and is expected to become fully active during fiscal year 1973.

4. Expenditures

A. Administration

For administration of the ESEA title II program in fiscal year 1972, the percent of total expenditures reported by the 50 participating States, American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Affairs, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands was 3.95, somewhat less than the amount available. (Table 1) Five percent of the amount paid to the State or $50,000, whichever is greater, is the amount available.

The $3.2 million expended for administation of the program in fiscal year 1972 compares with $1.9 million, $3.8 million, $4.4 million, $3.0 million, $2.4 million, and $3.2 million expended in fiscal years 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, and 1971 respectively. (Table 2) These figures indicate that State departments of education continue to use title II funds as much as possible for the acquisition of instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools, and spend conservatively in the area of program administration.

The distribution of funds expended for State administration by object of expenditures indicates that the largest proportion - $2.3 million or nearly 72 percent - went for salaries. (Table 3) Unexplained miscellaneous expenses (column 5) claimed the next largest proportion; very small amounts were used for indirect costs, contracted services, and equipment needed for program administration. Eleven States - Connecticut, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Missouri, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and West Virginia - made $77,324 in administrative funds available to local school districts for functions assigned to them for the distribution and control of materials acquired under title II.

The amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act enacted by P.L. 91-230 (Section 405 (b) of the General Education Provisions Act) concerning the extension through the succeeding fiscal year of the period of time during which appropriated funds can be expended applied to the title II funds appropriated for 1972. A total of $8.4 million (9.4 percent of the appropriation) was carried over from 1972 for expenditures in 1973. (Table 1, Column 8)

B. State Personnel in State Departments of Education

In fiscal year 1972, there were over 314 positions (in full-time equivalents) assigned to the administration of title II in State departments of education, an increase from fiscal year 1971 of about 22 positions. (Table 4) The in-

crease probably reflects the increased appropriation for title II, from $80 million in fiscal year 1971 to $90 million in fiscal year 1972.

The number of administrators assigned to title II continues to remain fairly constant; however, the number of supervisors assigned to the program continues to remain at a much lower figure than in the early years of title II. For example, in fiscal year 1968, 126 total full time supervisors were assigned to title II, as compared with about 70 in fiscal year 1972. School library supervisors, audiovisual, and subject and curriculum supervisors assigned to the program give valuable assistance in such program activities as project development and monitoring, inservice education activities, and revision of standards. Loss of such assistance frequently means insufficient professional direction and leadership in the organization and use of materials.

The number of secretaries and clerical positions assigned to title II rose slightly from 1971 to 1972 but there was a slight decline in the unidentified positions category. The latter includes consultants, research and evaluation staff, fiscal and statistical specialists, and nonprofessional employees such as truckdrivers and technicians who do not fall into the category of secretaries and clerks.

C. Acquisitions

In fiscal year 1972, school library resources claimed 89 percent of the acquisition funds, with 5.6 percent going for other instructional materials and less than 1 percent for textbooks. (Table 5) The proportion spent for both of the latter categories continues to decline.

Twenty-three States, the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands purchased school library resources only. For other instructional materials, which includes the same items as school library resources but not processed and organized, five States, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs expended more than 15 percent of acquisition funds.

In the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico where there are unusual linguistic problems and great need for text materials, over 23 percent of title II acquisition funds went for textbooks. Kentucky and New Mexico ranked highest among the 50 States in title II expenditures for textbooks, reflecting the need in Kentucky for new textbooks for regular and experimental programs and in New Mexico for bilingual textbooks.

In fiscal year 1972, $3.2 million was reported as expended for ordering, processing, cataloging, and delivering title II materials, an increase from fiscal year 1971 of about $600,000. (Table 5, column 9) Seven States - Arizona, Arkansas, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah, and Vermont, and American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs reported no funds expended for these services. For these and other States, such costs may be reported as part of the cost of acquisition so that the actual amount expended for these services is probably much higher

than the figure reported. It is also true, however, that much of the cost involved in processing is absorbed by local school districts, leaving more title II funds for buying materials.

Tables 6 and 7 show the cost of trade books, periodicals, other printed materials, and audiovisual materials purchased as school library resources or other instructional materials. Of $69 million expended for school library resources, 56 percent went for library books and almost 41 percent for audiovisual materials. The proportion of funds spent for cataloged and processed audiovisual materials continues its slow but steady rise. (Table 6, Column 9) In fiscal year 1972, 15 States - Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, Iowa, Kansas, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin - and the Virgin Islands expended 50 percent or more for audiovisual materials in the school library resources category.

Table 8 presents a summary of title II expenditures for materials over the seven year period. The proportion expended for audiovisual materials has risen from 19 to almost 41 percent during this period, indicating significant interest and effort in the use of audiovisual materials in elementary and secondary school teaching and learning.

II. Program Development

1. Technical Assistance in Project Development

State department of education personnel with title II responsibilities continued in fiscal year 1972 to provide field services to local education agencies in developing title II projects. To this end, they prepared and disseminated instructions, guidelines, and forms; held conferences; and made on-site visits to assist with project planning, implementation, and evaluation. Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania reported that regional conferences were held and followed up with on-site visits to give specialized attention in local project planning as a part of immediate and long-range program development. Pennsylvania also reported that a great deal of technical assistance in the evaluation and selection of materials is provided to local school personnel through the three regional centers where teachers and media specialists can examine media prior to selection.

In Georgia inservice conferences conducted at the State, area, and local levels by State staff emphasized selection and use of materials. Kentucky reports all 190 school districts monitored from the State level during the past year, either by the ESEA title II Coordinator or by the School Library Consultant. Mississippi had an open door policy of technical assistance to local education agencies in project development. The staff of the Educational Media Services unit was on call at all times to aid local school administrators either at the State office or in the local school office. Telephone calls and visits were the primary vehicles for giving assistance.

In Maryland the School Media Services Section staff visited each local educational agency during the fiscal year to observe strengths and weaknesses of

each in order to better assist other local agencies. North Carolina, South Carolina, Mississippi and Tennessee used on-site visits as the primary means of assisting school districts in project development and evaluation. Virginia reports that visitation reached its highest peak during 1972. Schools having no centralized media centers had pre-planning visits in connection with the proposed establishment of such a center. Follow-up visits were made. "Before and after" slides were prepared and shown to community groups as a means of publicizing the media program.

In the Upper Midwest much to little assistance to local educational agencies in project development was provided. Participation procedures and assistance to school districts whose applications needed revising were the two most frequent types of technical assistance. However, several States reported requests from local educational agencies for assistance in setting goals and objectives for media programs and focusing ESEA II and other funds on developing projects. Because of the Indiana legislative mandate that, by 1976, all schools incorporate the PPBS concept into their management, the State Department of Public Instruction (including the Instructional Media Personnel) is working with four pilot projects. Several other vehicles for technical assistance used by the States included workshops and area meetings, individual local education agency availability days throughout the State for purposes of completing applications on-site, publications such as Bulletin of Information (Ohio), Cataloging, Processing and Administering AV Materials, A Model for Wisconsin Schools (Wisconsin). and on-site visits.

In Idaho, six conferences were held in different geographic areas in cooperation with staff of titles I and III ESEA and title III NDEA for training in project development, objective writing, dissemination, and evaluation.

Many projects were monitored by the educational media consultant and special incentive grants were visited by staff from the evaluation section to assist with evaluation procedures. The title II administrator and the evaluation and dissemination staff met with every district submitting a special incentive grant proposal that was not funded to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the proposal and to recommend techniques for improving the project.

Individual schools were assisted in project development, program writing, and suggestions made regarding the selection of material, and evaluation of the library media program.

All local education agencies in California will be required after fiscal year 1973 to use the program-planning-budgetary system of accounting. The State ESEA title II staff has had training in PPBS. During fiscal year 1972, the staff placed heavy emphasis on program objectives and evaluation in regional meetings, on-site visits, and other consultations with local school personnel on project development. During the on-site visits, staff members were able to meet with all administrative personnel involved in decision making in project development, including the superintendent, the assistant superintendents for curriculum and business, the media personnel, and the building principal. This kind of planning is a part of the approvals process of all title II special-purpose grants, and frequently a part of the basic grants as well.

The Oregon Board of Education's priority on reading has required every school district in the State to submit a planning statement on reading to the State agency. Many title II projects pertain either directly or indirectly to reading. As a result, much time and effort has gone into the development of the projects. It is not uncommon for districts to plan a year or even two years in advance to determine the manner in which title II should relate to their reading programs.

During fiscal year 1972, Alaska held its first workshops at which State staff assisted local education agencies with the development of special-purpose and regular ESEA title II projects.

Proposal writing workshops and meetings were also held for the local districts in Washington State. During those sessions and on-site visits, the Learning Resources staff worked with teachers and librarians on planning, developing, and evaluating title II and related projects. Emphasis was placed on developing programs compatible with the Washington State Goals for the Common Schools.

2. Staff Development Activities

The administrative funds provided under title II have been an important factor in establishing sound programs of staff development for local school personnel participating in the title II program. Inservice education programs and consultative services have been directed toward helping teachers and media specialists with the selection, organization, and use of materials acquired under the program. Examples of the kind of staff development opportunities are:

Connecticut title II staff prepared a transparency-cassette program on writing school media instructional objectives and prepared a planning instrument to assist local school personnel in the design of facilities.

Utilization in Massachusetts of title II funds to sponsor a workshop - The Urban Child - Extending the Right to Read - and emphasizing visual as well as reading literacy. Special attention was given to the learning needs of black children and Spanish-speaking children.

New Hampshire field services have included on-site visits and workshops for teachers, media specialists, and elementary school library aides.

South Carolina held regional meetings to provide assistance in administration of media programs emphasizing a particular aspect such as the role of the media specialist in individualizing instruction in the evaluation of the media center program. In addition, the audiovisual consultant participated in 37 workshops in media production and equipment operation, stressing the newer types of materials. Mississippi held an inservice program which scheduled four meetings with media specialists and aides, emphasizing the organization of elementary school learning centers through a special system of coding for all learning materials to be used in instruction. Book catalogs were prepared for the teachers to use when planning for instruction and making

individual student prescriptions. The University of Southern Mississippi cosponsored with the State Department of Education a two-week workshop for 35 participants from both elementary and secondary media centers over the State. Puerto Rico held two special workshops. The first was for mathematics supervisors and coordinators of the new Geometry 500 program; the second was for a group of 20 Educational Technology specialists in the preparation of instructional packages for individual instruction.

Development and distribution of bibliographies was another feature. In response to a State-identified priority in Maryland, committees were organized to make lists of recommended books for ethnic groups. A State-sponsored committee was set up to review carefully all available materials for ethnic and cultural minorities with a publication suitable for use as a selection aid as a projected outcome. A routine part of the management of the special grants in North Carolina is the preparation and distribution of lists and bibliographies of materials used to support the project.

In-service meetings and workshops on regional and local levels, conducted throughout the Upper Midwest for teachers, librarians, and administrators, emphasized acquisition of quality materials, management and wise use of all types of materials. Michigan again sponsored two workshops in two northern Michigan Intermediate Districts for 90 untrained personnel who work in school libraries. In an attempt to coordinate college training programs with the library-media programs of the schools Kansas developed new guidelines for State school library media directors, worked on a two-year study of the feasibility of performance-based criteria for certifying library/media personnel and assisted with two research studies on the use made of library media by teachers and students.

Newsletters, brochures, films and slide tape presentations were used in inservice training at the local and regional levels.

With a grant from ESEA III Area VI Media Center, Marshalltown, Iowa collected, organized and circulated the professional film collections from the fifteen other regional centers. Book catalogs and WATS line from this center to each of the others made the collection easily accessible.

State Associations of School Librarians as well as other educational groups utilized the expertise of the State ESEA II personnel in association meetings.

Texas consultants conducted workshops and inservice meetings in programmed instruction, instructional design and production techniques, audiovisual equipment and its use, and individualized instruction, to provide training opportunities for local personnel with media responsibilities. Regular meetings of the Regional Service Center Media Directors with consultants of the Division of Instructional Media to consolidate efforts in the development of a unified State program, have enabled consultants to give concentrated attention to a smaller group having the capability of reaching a much larger audience.

The Washington State subject area supervisors and the media supervisors worked as a team through inservice, change process models, district consultation, and

school visitations to assist the field in effective selection, organization and utilization of all learning resources.

In the Fall, eight meetings were held in Hawaii for school librarians, school audiovisual coordinators, ETV coordinators, and district library/AV/ETV liaisons, and in May, four sessions were conducted in Oahu, Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai for school librarians in which discussion of the 1972-73 ESEA title II program was a part of the agenda. Procedures for applying for basic quotas and additional funds based on relative needs were reviewed.

The increase in title II funds over the previous year enabled California to expand the number of inservice programs and consultative services provided to local education agencies. Individual school districts received assistance from State personnel and ad hoc consultants in the selection, organization, and utilization of library resources. The employment of media experts from throughout California as consultants as needed in inservice programs by local education agencies was an important facet of the title II program and provided a strong supplement to the basic State staff.

Workshops were held in the Los Angeles area for private school personnel. The rapid turnover of administrators and media personnel in nonpublic schools necessitates these yearly meetings. Three different series of four media workshops were conducted in the San Francisco Bay area. These meetings were successful in assisting building level educators in the use of instructional materials. Approximately 600 participants including administrators, librarians, and teachers attended the workshops. Additionally 15 other workshops were held in other areas of the State. The annual title II, Phase II workshop was held in Sacramento with 150 persons in attendance.

3. Increased Employment of School Media Personnel

Title II has had substantial impact on the employment of media personnel for elementary and secondary schools and in school district central offices. Although title II funds cannot be used to pay salaries in local education agencies, the increased quantities of materials and the mounting demands for media services has encouraged the employment of staff.

The scope of title II impact on the employment of school media personnel is indicated in the following examples from the title II annual reports:

Connecticut - An estimated 429 media specialists were employed in Connecticut schools as a result of Federal programs of financial assistance, representing an increase of 34 over the previous year.

Maine - Five new full-time elementary school media specialists were employed in fiscal year 1972 as a direct result of the title II incentive grants.

New York - The employment of an additional 287 full-time media specialists, 9 media supervisors, and 231 aides as a result of Federal programs of financial assistance is a commendable degree of commitment to improved media services in a year of stringent demands on the tax payer's educational dollar.

Alabama cites the employment of full-time media aides under the Emergency School Assistance Act who generally work under the supervision of the instructional supervisor for the system. Georgia reports 1,900 school media personnel, 51 district media supervisors and 601 media aides, over 638 school media personnel, nine district supervisors, and no aides in the school year 1965-66. Federal aid has contributed to this growth but increased State and local funds plus improved standards have had a great impact. West Virginia has 1,402 media aides employed by ESEA title I. Puerto Rico has 48 of 384 school media staff members who are paid with Federal funds. Alabama and North Carolina report that the restriction of ESEA title I which prohibits librarians and aides paid with title I funds from serving non-title I children has prevented the use of this type of personnel in elementary school media centers, and that many schools which formerly employed such personnel no longer have their services.

Several Midwest States showed significant increases in employment of school media personnel--Missouri, 111 new full or part-time librarians positions added; Ohio, 100; Indiana, 100; Minnesota, 32 and 230 aides. On the other hand, the poor financial situation in some Michigan schools forced elementary school librarians out of the libraries and back to classroom teaching, with aides replacing them in the libraries.

In 1965 there were four elementary schools in Wyoming with qualified librarians. In 1972 there were forty five schools plus twenty six more who were under district level supervisors. The increased number includes six new positions for the 1971-72 year; two are district supervisors, three elementary coordinators and one a school librarian. All districts involved have been consistent title II participants.

Statistics from Utah reveal that over a six year period there has been a thirty percent increase in the number of professional employees working in instructional media centers. Because of fund limitations the number for 1972 was less than for 1971 pointing up the need for funds to provide for personnel.

Alaska, Oregon, and Washington State all reported an increase in the number of school media personnel employed in districts and schools as a result of Federal programs. The title II coordinator in Alaska attributed the hiring in school districts to the need to oversee Federal programs with materials components and to handle the new resources, particularly those audiovisual items added. The Oregon title II coordinator believes that the continuing realization by school districts that the individualization of learning is dependent upon the presence of a media center which is adequately staffed has encouraged school districts to employ more media specialists, technicians, and aides.

The Washington State Supervisor of Learning Resources was able to report comparable figures for full-time positions in fiscal year 1971 (in parentheses) and 1972:

12.5 (12) supervisors
22.8 (10) learning resources specialists
9.5 (3) technicians
129.7 (36) clerks and aides

At the same time, California reported a probable decrease in total staff from the previous year due to the increasingly critical financial problems of most local school districts, although the number remains higher than it was before the initiation of the title II program. In many cases, technicians and aides may have been retained to give some semblance of service in school media centers. This is a situation which is not likely to be alleviated until the financial support of the public school system in the State has been improved. Arizona law does not permit school districts to exceed the budget of the previous year by more than six percent without a vote of the district population. In making budget cuts, several of the very large high schools with two or three librarians limited the staff to fewer librarians and replaced them with clerks.

4. Selection of Materials

Reports from State departments of education on the administration of title II indicate sustained attention to the selection of materials to ensure that materials are of high quality, contribute substantially to instructional programs, and meet the varying needs of children and teachers in elementary and secondary schools.

Maine reports: Inservice education programs on the selection and use of newer media have been conducted. Consultative services have been provided on request with regard to selection, purchase, organization, and use of media. In addition, a bibliography of selection aids has been made available to all media specialists in the State.

In New York and Rhode Island, selected bibliographies on drug abuse, environmental/ecological education, and women's liberation were prepared and distributed. New York used the bibliographies with circulating collections of media which were sent to intermediate school agencies for teachers to examine prior to selection of media for individual schools. New York also reported the following information obtained from local school personnel:

> ESEA title II has enabled teachers to acquire certain needed quality materials which had been unobtainable previously because of higher cost.
>
> The additional title II funds enables schools to initiate selection of resources for independent study, for disadvantaged pupils, and for pupils with specialized interests.
>
> The earlier funding for fiscal year 1972 provided more time for the selection process and enabled schools to do a better job of selection.

In all Southeastern States, the plan of program operation mandated that only quality materials be selected. Kentucky's procedure for project approval includes checking the selection sources for items included in the project, thus insuring that recommended materials are being purchased. In North Carolina special groups of educators came in to the Department of Education to review and evaluate media in areas of common concern to school districts.

Bibliographies of media in these special areas were developed and distributed to all schools to be used as selection aids. An example of such a bibliography is Instructional Materials for Drug Education Programs. In Maryland, responsibility for the selection of materials is at the individual school level. Comments from two localities are:

> "ESEA title II has helped to place the focus on areas of need. As a result of title II grants, the media department has researched thoroughly to find quality materials in spotlighted areas."

> "Involving students has contributed to the selection of material which youth considers relevant."

After seven years of participation by the States in the ESEA title II program, subject matter supervisors are an integral part of the selection process at both the State and local level. In Alabama the art consultant has examined and recommended books, films, prints, replicas and other media that may be purchased with ESEA title II funds, and which may be used for visual arts programs but are also highly recommended for interdisciplinary units using the humanities approach.

Media specialists have attended visual arts workshops in order to be more knowledgeable. The Early Childhood specialist has assisted teachers through local inservice study and individual conferences in the selection and use of all types of media to support early childhood programs. In North Carolina the occupational education staff assisted in reviewing projects which involved career education. Advisory lists of media suitable for career education were made available to localities which had approved special media grants in that area. As an example, a county which also serves five other units will acquire 16 mm films related to job training, job acquisition, and job attitudes for junior and senior high school students. In South Carolina subject matter specialists note the increasing numbers of materials available for use by students. The average number of books per pupil is now 12.9, and collections are including more filmstrips, recordings, transparencies and programmed materials which are available to students. Efforts continue to be made to assist teachers and media specialists in selecting and utilizing all types of material, particularly since the State has relaxed the ESEA title II purchase restrictions to allow the use of funds for materials necessary for the implementation of special programs of instruction designed to meet critical needs of specific groups of children in reducing failures and dropouts.

In the Upper Midwest, State ESEA title II staff have made substantial contributions to the selection of materials of high quality for the use of both public and private school children and teachers by setting criteria for selection; providing information about selection sources; making available exhibits for previewing; assisting in workshops and inservice meetings, involving media personnel and other educators, for selecting, organizing, and utilizing materials; and evaluating collections in local schools while performing on-site reviews. Indiana school libraries began up-dating their selection policies.

All States in the Upper Midwest encourage local education agencies to select materials from a wide range of standard selection sources. ESEA title II funds are used to purchase the bibliographic sources. Extensive bibliographic sources, similar to Selected Sources for Materials in Minnesota Media Centers, were published and made available to local schools. State subject area consultants and media personnel prepared special selection aids as the Aerospace Books for Kansas Schools and Discovering Historic Iowa.

Much use is made of the professional materials, particularly audio visual materials from State departments of education professional libraries, often administered by ESEA title II and other media staff and supported partially from ESEA title II administrative funds.

Approximately fifteen workshops were held in Montana's Migrant Mobil Van to acquaint teachers of migrant children with library resources appropriate for use in the instruction of bilingual children. Eight reading workshops were held dealing with diagnosis, prescription, and use of materials in remedial reading programs. Listings of reading materials, microfiche, and tests were made available to teachers of children with special problems. An annotated bibliography of resources for slow and disenchanted learners of mathematics was distributed.

Title II staff in Oklahoma provided twenty two bibliographies of high quality material appropriate for elementary and secondary school pupils and teachers and also made available other aids published by the American Library Association.

Almost all the States in the West disseminated lists of special and new materials, and most reviewed project applications to be sure that the materials requested were suitable, of good quality, and would meet the instructional needs and objectives outlined on the applications. Nevada, among other States, reported that subject area consultants have assisted individual teachers and librarians in the selection of appropriate resources for enhancing curricular offerings and instructional programs. In Washington State, the subject area and the media supervisors worked as a team through inservice, change process models, district consultations, and school visitations to assist the field in effective selection, organization, and utilization of all learning resources. Since there are few people in American Samoa with knowledge or background in the selection and evaluation of materials, the Library Supervisor arranged for a class in children's literature to be taught at the Community College and open to elementary school teachers and library staff members. The plan is to follow this with a course on adolescent literature. In addition, a summer workshop was conducted for the staff.

The title II office in Arizona maintained a collection of new materials for examination. Opening of the Library Media Center in the new Education Building will provide for a larger collection and inclusion of both print and nonprint materials. The title II administrator, at the request of administrators of a number of small schools, made selections and sent the lists back to the administrators for additions or changes. This was helpful to schools in remote areas which do not have trained personnel and who seem to rely on publishers' catalogs.

Washington State's Small Schools Sharing program, which encourages individualized instruction in the classroom, has helped many other districts in addition to those involved in the program. The materials included in the packages were based on learning activity packages developed by participating teachers.

5. Coordination With Other Federal Programs

In fiscal year 1972, coordination of the ESEA title II program with other programs of Federal financial assistance continued. Subject area consultants and other State department of education personnel assisted title II staff in the review of title II project applications; selection of materials; and monitoring projects. In turn, title II coordinators and supervisors performed similar services for other programs and provided technical assistance in the area of media services.

Title II funds were frequently used to acquire instructional materials for projects funded under titles I and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act while these two programs and title III-A of the National Defense Education Act were used to obtain media facilities, professional and clerical media personnel, and media center equipment and supplies which are not eligible under title II.

Following are examples of the coordination of title II with other Federal programs:

In New York, materials purchased under title II are used in after-school and summer programs and programs for migrant children which are operated under title I. New York also funded 105 unigrants or joint ESEA title II-NDEA title III projects.

The coordination of other Federal programs is a priority criterion in rating and awarding the special-purpose grants made to Vermont secondary schools.

In Alabama, the transfer of the title II program to the Federal Programs Section has made close coordination with other Federal programs possible. A number of special purpose grants for 1972 were coordinated with the Model Right to Read programs under ESEA title I. ESEA title II funds have been widely used to undergird special projects such as the Phenix City Right to Read program, Early Childhood program, Special Education and Language Arts programs. In Kentucky regular staff meetings were held in the Bureau of State and Federal Relations of the Department of Education to emphasize such coordination. Close coordination with and participation in the Right to Read program continues. ESEA title II continues to provide funds to local school districts for special programs designed to meet the needs of the educationally deprived under the ESEA title I program. It also provides funds to support programs for the mentally and physically handicapped children under the ESEA title VI program. Tennessee describes a close working relationship with the Public Library System which administers the LSCA title III program and the Division of Instruction which administers the ESEA titles and NDEA title III, and from which much has been gained. A special education materials center

which is housed in the office of the Educational Media Services in Mississippi was established through a grant from ESEA title VI in 1969. This materials center has proven very valuable to media personnel in the State because they have been able to examine special types of instructional materials intended for children with learning disabilities. Many of these materials have potential for use in the regular classroom.

Special bibliographies were compiled by the Educational Media Services and distributed throughout the State for use as selection aids on purchasing tools. In Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina cooperation between ESEA title II and NDEA III has been strengthened by the fact that both programs are the responsibility of the same administrator. The philosophy underlying this type of program operation is that implementation of the comprehensive educational program necessitates effective coordination of all Federal assistance programs at the local level, expedited by pre-planning and coordination at the State level.

Coordinating ESEA II and NDEA III has been quite effective in all the States of the Upper Midwest. Five of the twelve of these States have one administrator for both programs. Every State reported that not only did ESEA II and NDEA III coordinators work closely at the State level, but local school coordinators were able to develop projects incorporating funds for "software" from ESEA II and funds for "hardware" from NDEA III. Joint Advisory Committees serve both programs in Nebraska and Ohio. State title II staff profited by the upgrading of State Departments of Education under ESEA V.

Cooperative efforts with the State Library were especially productive in Indiana where a joint three-day conference on Right to Read for public and school librarians was held, and in Illinois where University of Illinois Library Research Center conducted an Illinois School Library Media Survey for Illinois Library Association, Illinois Association of School Librarians, Illinois State Library and Media/Library Services Unit of the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction.

ESEA III provided funds for the establishment and implementation of a Cooperative Network of Instructional Resources, a project submitted by an Iowa ESEA II Area Center.

The small staff in Idaho and the close proximity of program directors offices facilitate close coordination of programs. In addition to constantly reminding local education agencies of the possibility of strengthening one program by utilizing another, State staff in Idaho held cooperative project development workshops on ESEA titles I, II and III, and NDEA title III in six geographic regions.

At the direction of its State Legislature, California uses a single consolidated application form for all Federal programs of financial assistance to elementary and secondary education. Washington State has developed and put into use an application form which includes ESEA titles I, I - Migrant, II, and III, NDEA title III-A, Johnson O'Malley, State Gifted, and Urban, Rural, Racial, Disadvantaged (URRD) Programs. Alaska has developed and is using a single application form for ESEA title II and NDEA title III.

Many States in the West with separate applications for categorical programs reported close coordination in local district projects of title II with other Federal and State sources of funding. Most frequently mentioned were those with equipment acquired under NDEA title III and ESEA title I programs in reading and mathematics.

Materials bought under title II were also used in Arizona in projects supported by EHA (Education for the Handicapped), Part B, the Vocational Education Act, EPDA (Education Professions Development Act), Title V - B2, ESEA title III, and a new district-wide values - drug curriculum being implemented across grade levels as a result of a federally subsidized drug abuse research program. Hawaii reported coordination of title II components with LSCA title I in programs for emotionally disturbed children in a residential treatment center and for children in the Hawaii School for the Deaf and Blind.

In American Samoa, the additional audiovisual resources acquired with NDEA title III funds were handled by LSCA personnel in the community-high library centers. The bookmobile purchased with LSCA funds and partially stocked by ESEA title II is now making stops at village schools in areas where library service was limited or nonexistent. It also serves early childhood teachers in villages without schools.

6. Improving Accessibility of Materials

Optimum use of the instructional materials purchased under title II funds depends in large measure on administrative and scheduling practices that permit free and easy use of materials of all kinds. Reports from title II coordinators and State school media specialists indicate that elementary and secondary school media centers are increasingly developing flexible schedules that enable teachers to bring classes or groups to the media center at the times best suited to classroom instruction. Simplified attendance procedures are also used to permit individuals and small groups to have quick and easy access to the media center from classrooms and other study areas.

New Jersey reports: "All media consultants are urging administrators to develop flexible scheduling for easy access to materials. A real problem exists in elementary schools when teachers have negotiated contracts providing a free period and school administrators see a library period as the implementation of the contract. Librarians are urged to work with administrators and faculty prior to negotiation and press for additional teaching staff if this is the problem.

In Rhode Island, a workshop on the open school concept was held for media specialists and principals. Considerable attention was given to the accessibility of resources to pupils and teachers and the contribution that full access can make to the variety, richness, and effectiveness of the instructional program. The title II coordinator has reported that real progress can be seen in the schools as a result of this activity.

The Director of School Libraries in Pennsylvania also reported holding workshops on flexible scheduling. During these workshops, sample schedules for media center use were distributed, as well as a list of schools using flexible scheduling so that other people could visit them.

Recognition throughout the States of the fact that accessibility of materials is the key to a truly individualized instructional program has brought about relaxation of the regulations governing the use of materials both inside and outside the media center. In Florida, the change is a major thrust. Acessibility of materials is stressed in every conference and school visit. Specifically the following practices are being encouraged:

1. Placing all printed and audiovisual media on open shelves for use by students and teachers.

2. Extending the hours that media center services are available.

3. Arranging for regional cooperation for maximum utilization of materials where appropriate.

4. Cataloging centrally all media within a school.

In addition, a bulletin Educational Media in Florida Schools has been prepared for distribution to school administrators to encourage the promotion of administrative practices that permit easy accessibility of materials. In South Carolina, some media centers as part of the emphasis on individualization of instruction, have begun the circulation of both audiovisual materials and equipment for home use by students and teachers. In Kentucky more and more school media centers are being opened up for blocks of time with free access. One of the major emphases from the Division of Media Services concerns the availability and utilization of materials, and if the changes necessary for maximum utilization involve changes in scheduling, staffing, or storage, these changes must be made. In Alabama administrators are in essence eliminating scheduled study halls in the center, freeing it for easy access to those who wish to use the facility and materials.

The North Dakota philosophy, "for maximum effectiveness any class, any group, or any individual should be permitted to go to the media center for needed information or materials without pre-scheduling" illustrates to a large extent the philosophy of other States. The employment of professional media staff has done much to spread the practice of free and easy use of instructional materials. However the elimination of administrative barriers and scheduling practices remains a major concern to a number of State school library supervisors. The South Dakota ESEA II Northeast Learning Center held five inservice meetings with main emphasis, "How Scheduling Improves the Role of the Library in the Curriculum."

In Texas, constant effort is made to identify and disseminate information regarding superior programs. Wide publicity is given to schools with good practices in making materials available such as in open schools, schools on the quarter system, and schools with extended hours of service.

Accreditation teams emphasize the effective use of instructional materials in meeting student needs and in individualizing instruction.

Public school districts that have private schools within their boundaries must establish a committee representative of all administrative units to develop a

plan for making materials available. Such planning has resulted in novel approaches to meeting the needs of all pupils and teachers.

Lists of expensive or special materials are prepared annually for circulation to all public and private schools in each district to assure maximum usage.

Efforts have been successfully made in American Samoa to encourage principals to allow the teachers and students to take books home with them. The teachers are now allowed to have and use books in their classrooms. Before 1970 this was not true; all teaching was done through television, with no supplementary materials. There are currently three resource centers under construction which will be used as demonstration centers for the use of materials.

Accessibility to the media center by all students throughout the school day is emphasized in inservice meetings and during on-site visits by California State staff. There is also strong encouragement to allow all library resources to be available for home circulation by students. As materials become more plentiful, administrators are relaxing their attitudes toward home use of both materials and equipment. Changes at the elementary level are particularly evident as more and more schools move from rigidly scheduled library periods for teaching library skills to more flexible programs that are increasingly integrated with classroom learning experiences and skills taught at the time of need. As new facilities are planned and old facilities remodeled, the Washington State Supervisors of Learning Resources continued to stress flexibility of scheduling and in arrangement of the centers themselves. At both elementary/secondary school levels, participating districts listed materials for individualizing instruction as their greatest need. Individualized instruction demands scheduling practices that permit free and easy use of all materials of all kinds. In their publications, visitations, and conferences, subject area supervisors continued to encourage open programs to all levels in all subject areas.

7. Development and Revision of Standards

One of the functions State departments of education fulfill in the administration of title II is the development, revision, dissemination, and evaluation of standards relating to the selection, acquisition, and use of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials. A U.S. Office of Education survey reported in 1964 that only three States - Alaska, Massachusetts, and Utah - and the Virgin Islands did not have State school library standards; however, the standards of five other States - Alabama, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and West Virginia - were for secondary schools only.[1]

---

[1]Richard L. Darling. Survey of School Library Standards. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964. p. 4-5

Since 1964, the 50 States, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs have either developed or revised standards for school library resources in elementary and secondary schools for use in the title II program or have adopted the standards of a professional organization. Administrative funds from title II have assisted State departments of education to evaluate and revise standards and disseminate and interpret them through publications, conferences, workshops, and other program activities.

The Vermont title II coordinator is working closely with the State Educational Media Association committee on standards and other State Department of Education staff members in the revision of standards for school library resources. The standards of other States and those of national media organizations are being used as guides.

Massachusetts endorses the national Standards for School Media Programs and does not have separate State standards. An advisory committee on standards has, however, developed a media facilities brochure for use with school committees and local building committees designing new school media facilities. Massachusetts has also introduced an incentive measure into its relative need formula which serves to reward systems working toward and coming close to meeting standards, the incentive factor has served to stimulate the establishment in 1971-72 of 114 new school media centers and the expansion of an additional 2,309 media centers.

While only one State of the Southeast, Maryland,reported revised standards in 1972, all of these States reported tremendous progress toward the goal of reaching old standards, and in many cases, surpassing them. Alabama and Kentucky report new standards in process; Florida had new standards approved in 1971. Maryland distributed copies of the new standards, entitled Criteria for Modern School Media Centers to all members of the Maryland Library Community. These criteria are standards which provide incentives and guidelines for schools which are incorporating new educational approaches in their curricular programs.

The Division of Educational Media in North Carolina, through a series of meetings with advisory committees, has developed a draft of Guidelines for School Media Programs. The guidelines present a plan for developing a comprehensive unified media program which refers to all services related to printed, audio-visual, and televised media available to students and teachers by a media center and its staff. Virginia is in the process of developing standards for non-print materials not previously having quantitative standards.

All States reported substantial contributions by ESEA title II in the effort to meet State standards. In Georgia the average number of books per pupil is now 11.6. The progress toward other standards (staff, facilities, budget) is even greater. ESEA title II has directly influenced the progress toward meeting standards for materials and has indirectly influenced the progress in other areas. In Mississippi only two of the 1,024 public schools in the State fail to meet the minimum accreditation standards. ESEA title II has

consistently contributed funds enabling both elementary and secondary schools to meet State standards for library materials. In Virginia the average expenditure for library materials per child has risen from $3.29 in 1964-65 to $7.57 in 1970-71, while the average number of books per child has risen from 7.5 to 11. ESEA title II provides approximately 20% of the public school library budget for the State which is considered a substantial contribution. South Carolina reports that more than 90% of all schools have reached State standards for books since 1965. ESEA title II funding has been a major factor in providing materials for the schools that meet acceptable standards for all materials, and in many cases has been the only way schools have been able to provide any meaningful amount of material in their media centers.

State standards for school library resources in most States of the Upper Midwest reflect the ALA-NEA 1969 Standards for School Media Programs. The following table illustrates the activity on standards in Upper Midwest States during the past year:

Complete Revision	In Process of Revising	Minor Revisions	Implementing Recent Revisions
Illinois	Michigan	Indiana	Iowa
Kansas	South Dakota	Nebraska	Minnesota
North Dakota			Missouri
Wisconsin			Ohio

Progress in meeting standards in school media programs is mixed, depending more on the strength of local support than on size of schools.

Five of the ten States in the mid-continent region - Arkansas, Idaho, Montana, Texas, Utah - revised at least part of their library media standards during the 1972 school year. Of the remaining five, Oklahoma revised its standards during 1971, and Colorado and Louisiana have revisions scheduled for 1973.

Idaho State standards, called Guidelines for School Library Resources, were completely revised into the publication Your Media Program, K-12. This revision has been approved by the Idaho State Board of Education to be effective September 1, 1972.

A revised set of media standards has been adopted in the State of Nevada. These standards will be utilized as an evaluative instrument for all school libraries in the State and in schools served by ESEA title II projects. The standards are modeled after the 1969 ALA-NEA standards and are a combination of quantitative and qualitative criteria. The standards are the direct result of work by the coordinator of the title II program in the State Agency in cooperation with a committee of school administrators, teachers, and librarians.

The Learning Resources Specialists serve as ad hoc members of the Standards Committee of the Washington State Association of School Librarians. This group has been charged to work with the Superintendent of Public Instruction's

accreditation team. Presently the Standards Committee is studying five documents concerned with standards for school library resources: (General Guidelines for Minimum Approval Requirements for Purposes of Apportionment, September 1971; Standards for Accreditation of Comprehensive Secondary Schools, July 1968; Suggested Goals for Washington Common Schools, September 1971; The Northwest Associations of Secondary and Higher Schools; Handbook: Standards for Accreditation: Consultation; Learning Resources Center: Standards for Integrating School Library and Media Services, 1968)

III. Title II's Commitment to Right To Read

1. Notable Reading Projects - A Publication

The Office of Education continued in fiscal year 1972 to publish the series of reports describing notable reading projects funded under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Five issues were published during the year. Their purpose was to disseminate information on title II's contribution to reading development and describe good practices that could be emulated or adapted for use in other schools.

The projects described in the ten bulletins published in fiscal years 1971 and 1972 were funded in 36 States, the District of Columbia, Guam, and in schools conducted for Indian children by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. These projects, numbering over 200, have served about 398,466 public and private school children with expenditures for reading and other instructional materials amounting to over $3 million. The projects have generally been directed toward regular elementary and secondary school programs; however, some have also been coordinated with reading instruction in special types of institutions such as schools operated by correctional institutions and programs for emotionally disturbed children. They have also served such target groups as disadvantaged, gifted, and handicapped children.

2. Representative Creative Projects in Reading

It is clear from the 1972 annual reports that the title II program has made a considerable contribution to reading development. Nearly every State has reported increased funding of title II reading projects and has provided brief descriptions of some of the more creative projects.

To offset the problems of limited school library facilities, a rural geography that prevents easy access to public libraries, and a lack of quality titles for children in local book stores, 15 copies of 227 individualized paperback books were divided among three elementary schools in the Merrimack, New Hampshire Supervisory Union. Teachers have reported that the children are very enthusiastic about the books and have made noticeable improvement in reading since the inception of the program.

A somewhat similar project was funded in a secondary school in the Acton-Boxborough Regional School District in Massachusetts. This title II project involved the purchase of materials for a humanities curriculum for three classes of "non-college" ninth grade pupils. Since these students were not academically oriented, the emphasis was not on literary classics and man's

cultural heritage. Instead, readable, contemporary paperback books supplemented by films and other media centered around immediate human concerns such as the need for others, significance of family, changing views about society, and acceptance of others. The most visible result of the program has been the increased involvement in communication on the part of the pupils - greater willingness to express themselves in speech and writing, and to respond to each other and to their teachers.

The ESEA title II State Plan for West Virginia mandates that each local unit must direct at least one-third of its allocation toward the Right to Read program. Harrison County spent its entire allocation to support the Right to Read program and chose to use a traveling teacher approach; Pendleton County used the Learning Center approach while Taylor County used the multi-sensory approach. Instructional materials involved in these programs include books, filmstrips, recordings, pictures, maps, charts, transparencies and cassette tapes for both group and individual use. In Puerto Rico, the Right to Read program is being implemented in nine junior high schools. Eighty seventh graders from each school are participating. Diagnostic Reading Skills Tests in English and in Spanish were administered at the beginning of the project. The purpose was to reinforce reading skills initiated in the elementary level through the use of remedial work materials that are of particular interest and of more appeal to the groups involved. It is expected that the results of the achievement tests administered after a year will demonstrate a significant gain in the acquisition and management of reading skills. A school in Trujillo Alto with title II funds has a first grade reading readiness program. Children are motivated by the librarian to read through story-telling, filmstrips, and reading circles. Mothers and teachers work together to prepare teaching materials to be used for dramatization and story-telling. Mothers are also trained to help children with homework and to contribute to reading readiness by doing some story-telling for pre-school children. In Clark County, Kentucky, the reading program is particularly interesting because the librarians and the classroom teachers have worked very closely to provide a varied approach to reading. Each elementary teacher uses a different reading series and approach, and through testing hopes to establish proof of the effectiveness of techniques being used in the teaching of reading. Much of the material being used was purchased with ESEA title II funds.

Efforts continued at an accelerated pace in Upper Midwest States to provide good quality print and nonprint materials which led to improvement in reading skills and enjoyment. One such effort in the regular ESEA II program was the Lansing, Michigan Public School District's:

> "Eastern's English Department faced the antipathy to reading of the students in non-college bound classes by making Friday a free-reading day. The aim of the program was to create good reading habits in the student. In order to remove the threat from the reading experience, students could read any library book of their choice or borrow one of a series of high interest paperbacks the Department had selected. The confident reader was encouraged to select his own book from the library and the reluctant reader was directed to a book he might easily read. We were pleased with the eagerness of students and the silence during

the hour. Students were so engrossed in their reading that we decided the teacher did not have to be in the room. Since no formal teaching occurred, we decided this would be a good opportunity to involve parents with the school. We invited parents to come to the classrooms on Fridays to free teachers for planning, reviewing of new programs, and the observation of other teachers and master lessons. The program created a change in students' attitudes toward reading. One hundred and fifty of the one thousand students said they had never finished a book. Each student read more than the three books that were required for the semester; over five hundred read all the ten books we had selected. Students read much more material and at a more rapid rate than we had anticipated and the fifteen parents evaluated the program favorably, each continuing during the second semester."

A number of States, including Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Missouri, Ohio, and Wisconsin set aside a portion of their acquisition funds for special reading projects. One example of such special projects is:

The Family Reading Incentive Mini-Library Project, Mt. Vernon Junior High School, Mt. Vernon, Indiana, provided 90 mini-libraries of books, periodicals, records, tapes and filmstrips for long term loan to students and their families. The collections were planned to meet family interests and were placed in those homes where reading was not generally regarded as important.

Title II funds were used in the Sunny Ridge School, Nampa, Idaho, for book and non book materials to develop clusters of centers (reviewing, listening, recording, skill development, recreational reading) within the main library resource center. Second grade students in the school showed a .7 gain in the instructional reading level as indicated on the Silvaroli Reading Inventory. The third grade students showed a gain of 2.5. Improved vocabulary and reading comprehensive scores as measured by the Iowa Test of Basic Skills for third grade students showed an improvement of 1.85. The number of books read by students of the first three grades increased from two per week to five.

In Arizona, $100,000 of the State ESEA title II allotment was set aside for special grants in support of the Right to Read effort. The 190 applications received requested over $525,000. Sixty-four projects were funded. One in Desert Foothills School, Washington Elementary School District, Phoenix, was for materials to support a project for 20 sixth-grade boys whose reading levels range from 1.5 - 3.5. The project was called the Cooks and Cars Program and was aimed at two high interest areas--the boys' stomachs and fast wheeled vehicles. Another in Townsend Junior High School, Santa Cruz Valley Union High School District, Eloy, supplied materials for a project designed to broaden knowledge of our races and cultures, and of current problems.

There were numerous reading projects providing printed and audiovisual materials from title II in Hawaii. Among them was the Individualized Reading Project for Children of Recent Samoan Immigrants, designed to provide diagnosis,

prescription, and treatment of reading deficiencies through a multi-media approach with an audio-tutorial orientation for grades K-6 in Kapunahala School. In Farrington High School, grades 10-12, another reading project was called the Right to Read Paperbacks. Its goal was to put more books into the hands of students and to develop a more positive attitude among them toward reading.

IV. Services to Private School Children and Teachers

Title II provides, that to the extent consistent with State law, school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials acquired under the program are to be provided on an equitable basis for the use of children and teachers in private elementary and secondary schools in the States which comply with the compulsory attendance laws or otherwise recognized by it through some other procedure customarily used in the States. State department of education staff, local public school administrators, and private school authorities report favorably on the relationship between public and private school officials in connection with the program. Representatives of private schools serve on title II advisory committees and have been very useful in developing acceptance and understanding of the program.

New Hampshire gave particular attention to the needs of private school administrators in fiscal year 1972 by holding a State-wide conference for private school officials. The conference agenda provided considerable time for explanations about the title II program and was well received by those in attendance.

The Massachusetts title II coordinator reported the following information on the participation of private school children and teachers in title II:

> Massachusetts private school children and teachers participated in the title II program in fiscal year 1972 at the usual high rate. Office conferences with private school representatives amounted to about 9 or 10 percent of our total conferences. The individual in the title II office who serves as liaison with private schools was in daily contact with private school administrators about the program. Title II projects serving children and teachers in 18 private schools were monitored by State school media staff.

In the Southeastern States, services to private school children and teachers varied widely from State to State. Maryland provided assistance by:

1. Conferring with the Coordinators of Library Programs of the Archdiocese of Washington and the Archdiocese of Baltimore. These Archdiocese are handled as systems. Conferences were held with the coordinators of library programs for each Archdiocese.

2. Providing guidelines and procedures to assist in the development of projects.

3. Making allocations according to the priorities and formula.

4. Providing schools with a list of approved selection sources.

5. Providing schools with instructions for requesting materials on loan.

6. Providing inservice training to Archdiocese personnel.

7. Visiting non-public schools.

8. Cooperating with the Division of Certification and Accreditation, Nonpublic Elementary and Secondary Section.

Tennessee makes services of the State film library available to private school staff directly through the State Department of Education. The Alabama ESEA title II Coordinator assisted private school personnel with inservice programs, spoke at institutes, and made consultative visits to 15 private schools as requested. Services in other States were generally confined to encouraging participation in the program and answering specific requests for information. In North Carolina the children and teachers of 76 non-public schools participated in the program in 1972 as opposed to 50 in 1971.

In Puerto Rico, in addition to written information provided to the personnel of private schools about all aspects of program participation, on site visits were made by the General Supervision from each program to assist non-public personnel in relation to administrative procedures.

Four States, Alabama, Georgia, Maryland and Mississippi administer the ESEA title II program to private schools from the State level. In Florida, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia private schools are served by the local education agencies in which the schools are located.

To a degree all States of the Upper Midwest extended some services to private school teachers, media personnel and administrators. Inservice media programs, workshops and meetings are open to teachers and administrators from private schools. One member of the Iowa ESEA Title II Advisory Committee represents the private school sector. State ESEA II publications are made available to these schools. Missouri State ESEA II personnel assist non-public school administrators, where needed, with reports substantiating maintenance of effort.

The formula used to establish relative need was the same for public and private schools. The non-public schools supplied data to the local education agency administering the program for the children and teachers in the public and private elementary and secondary schools.

Though ownership of materials made available to private school children and teachers is vested in different agencies in the several States (intermediate districts in Michigan, the State education agency in Wisconsin, a private

agency in Nebraska, and local education agencies in all other Upper Mid-West States), materials were provided on an equitable basis.

Non-public school children and teachers participated in the special needs projects in those States which set aside a portion of their acquisition funds for special needs or special purpose projects.

Several States of the Mid-Continent region report identical services for private and public school children and teachers with the exception of ownership and location of materials.

Each local education agency in Texas having a private school within its boundaries, must appoint a committee representative of the administrations of all private schools with eligible students. The purpose of the committee is to determine the relative need of pupils and teachers, to make recommendations on the types and kinds of materials, and to develop an equitable plan for making all materials purchased under the local education agency project available to all pupils and teachers in the district, including those pupils and teachers in the private schools.

Private school teachers, media personnel, and administrators are welcomed and encouraged by the Texas Education Agency to participate in all inservice offerings, informational meetings, and professional organization meetings featuring effective utilization of materials. Inquiries concerning library programs or requests for library assistance are answered for private schools on the same basis as those from public schools.

Private school personnel in increasing numbers attended the California ESEA title II regional meetings and received technical assistance with the development of their projects. Workshops especially for private school personnel were again held in Los Angeles, and in San Diego for the members of the San Diego Diocese Schools. Individual requests for assistance were received in larger numbers than in previous years and were answered by State staff. Three of California's 31 fiscal year 1972 special projects were awarded to private school personnel through the public school districts in which they are located. All projects submitted under the Phase II program were scored competitively by field reviewers; the three for children in private schools proved to be worthy contenders. The Washington State ESEA title II plan was revised to include a new section for non-public school participants, and project applications forms were also revised to include the names and titles of the private school staff who were represented in the assessment of needs, planning, selection of materials, and implementation of the title II program. The Assistant Director of Secondary Education served as the liaison person between the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the private sector. When title II problems could not be resolved at the local level, he and the supervisor of learning resources served as the intermediaries. Three of the 16 members of the title II Learning Resources Advisory Committee represent the private sector. Through their input, the State agency is able to serve them more adequately.

V. Evaluation and Dissemination

1. Impact

Evidence of the impact of title II on curriculum and instruction, development of unified media programs, and the introduction into schools of newer types of instructional materials was obtained by State department of education staff through observations, interviews, anecdotal records, case studies, and project applications and reports.

A. Support of Curriculum and Instruction

Funds from title II may be used to support the development of curriculum and instruction in every subject area of the elementary and secondary school program. Information obtained from title II annual reports indicate that the increased quantities of materials made available has had a remarkable effect on the educational opportunities made available to pupils through use of media.

(1) Increasing and Improving Use of Materials in Elementary and Secondary School Subjects

Many title II projects are specific plans to provide school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for use in one or more elementary and secondary school subjects. In developing the projects, teachers and media specialists examine the adequacy of instructional resources already available in relation to the specific educational requirements of the children and teachers who use materials. These considerations then form the basis for selection of the new materials to be acquired under title II.

The title II Coordinator in New York reported:

> The use of materials provided under ESEA title II has contributed effectively to the State program for the improvement of instruction in the elementary and secondary school subject areas. New and revised curriculums at the State level emphasize a conceptual approach to learning. These new programs, based on inquiry, have been developed concomitantly with the media center concept, de-emphasizing textbooks and emphasizing the use of a multiplicity of resources. The education redesign effort in New York relies heavily on the availability of learning resources to provide the flexibility needed in a truly learner centered system of education.

Title II coordinators in a number of States report the use of resources acquired under title II in traditional elementary and secondary school subjects such as science and mathematics, reading, social studies, and foreign languages; however, they also report the use of media in other areas such as career education and the arts and humanities. New Hampshire, with its long history of emphasis on vocational education, reports the use of title II funds to support several programs in this area. In Pennsylvania, the title II coordinator reports extensive use of title II funds to provide art prints, recordings, and biographies of artists, musicians, and writers for use in arts and humanities programs.

All States of the Southeast report a distinct impact from the use of ESEA title II funds on increasing and improving the instructional resources in elementary and secondary school subjects. The Georgia State Department of Education has encouraged local education agencies to develop their own curriculum guides. A major point of each guide must be concerned with supplementary materials. Schools have obtained many of these materials through the provisions of ESEA title II. In South Carolina, the media centers with these improved physical facilities encourage greater teacher interest, cooperation, and student participation. Subject matter consultants are reporting that audiovisual materials formerly kept, and sometimes locked, in separate rooms are now an indispensable part of everyday classwork and not simply an option to be reserved for special occasions. The laboratory approach is being used more and more by teachers and students, and in many cases audiovisual equipment and material is being circulated for home use. ESEA title II has provided sufficient relevant material to make these changes possible.

In the Upper Midwest States, classroom visitation and conferences with teachers provided real evidence that more teachers have access to a wide range of materials and are using these effectively. Where selection has been a cooperative effort of media personnel, teachers and students almost "instant" utilization has occurred.

Criteria established for selecting materials purchased with ESEA II funds have helped to assure to a greater degree, the purchase of quality materials for media centers and classroom collections, purchased with not only ESEA II funds, but also State and local funds. Nebraska reported that in the area of social studies, quality relevant and objective resources had strengthened social studies instruction in the schools.

The Whitefish Elementary School and the Billings High School in Billings, Montana utilized math resource centers to implement their individualized instruction program in mathematics.

It was observed in Colorado that when various types of materials are placed in schools, the increased use of such materials as an integral part of the instructional program creates a demand for more materials.

Children in American Samoa have been supplied good, well-illustrated books in their schools for the first time under title II. The children had been denied books for such a long time because all instruction was through the medium of television that it has been impossible to satisfy their desires fast enough. The best way was flooding the elementary and secondary schools with good paperbacks. Through the materials, whole new vistas of learning are opening up.

To implement the philosophy of individualization, inquiry, and independent learning in Washington State, teachers were made aware of the necessity of having available a variety of learning tools supportive of various subject areas. Many of these materials are provided with title II assistance.

The evidence of materials acquired under title II being used for individualization of instruction in Oregon is in the increasing demand for individual

additional instructional materials storage in the classroom. School officials constantly emphasize the demand for space, which is the result of increasing the quantity of materials required to teach all subjects to 15 students in an individualized manner. One thing can be said for certain about the impact of title II in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Educators in the various districts would like more help of the kind provided by this program. They have seen what good can come from the increased resources especially in social studies and mathematics, and they want more. Such a request, along with a desire for greater decentralization in use of funds came to the attention of the Congress of Micronesia during 1972.

(2) Use of Materials In Innovative Teaching Programs

The annual reports on title II from State departments of education include many examples of title II's contribution to innovative teaching strategies. Such new techniques of instruction as modular and flexible scheduling, individualized programs, interdisciplinary courses, inquiry learning, and simulation and games teaching require large quantities of media which are often provided with the help of title II funds.

The following examples illustrate the use of materials provided under title II in educational programs that stress individualization, inquiry, and independent learning in elementary and secondary school subjects:

> Schoolyard Ecology. Children enrolled in the Dedham, Massachusetts Country Day School carried out a year-long study of all animal, vegetable, and mineral life on their 10 acre campus which includes a small pine grove, a deciduous swamp, a field, and a small pond. The field guides and 8mm filmloops provided by title II were essential to the project and the evaluations of them by children and teachers are interesting and illuminating.
>
> Use of Media in Social Studies. Two secondary schools in Bristol, Connecticut restructured the social studies curriculum to introduce a multimedia and multi-text approach involving both assigned and voluntary group and independent projects requiring wide reading and use of media. These innovations meant expansion of the media collections in both schools.

Special grants in North Carolina which stress innovative approaches include:

> Onslow County will package a variety of take-home kits which will be planned for use in the non-school environment for the middle grade children to encourage motivate and enrich individualized learning.
>
> Gates County High School will acquire media to implement a new approach to the senior high school social studies curriculum. Additional media, including super 8mm loops, art and study prints, simulations, recordings, sound filmstrips and printed media, will be selected to change the traditional learning concepts to those which involve students in the inquiry and discovery methods.

In Mississippi, media personnel work closely with teachers in selecting, analyzing, and using instructional media. Through this endeavor any independent inquiry, study, or learning attempted by the student is strengthened, not only through the available resources, but also through the assurance that expert guidance in resources materials is available from both teacher and media specialist. In many cases in Mississippi ESEA title II has provided the resources for the teacher to assume the role of a diagnostician or prescriber who refers the prescription and the student to the media specialist.

In one very rural school division in Virginia, language arts students were encouraged to express their individuality by writing a book about themselves, their families, their pets. Awards in several categories and at various grade levels were made to participating children. This activity was supported by materials from the media center and proved to be very stimulating and exciting to all involved.

Individually Guided Education/Multi-unit Schools-Elementary (IGE/MUS-E) number more than 200 in Wisconsin. As the Department personnel who work with the Research and Development Center at the University promote the development of IGE programs, they emphasize the essential nature of excellent instructional materials services as part of developing a student-centered, inquiry-oriented IGE program. At the secondary school level many of the programs across the State are moving toward modular scheduling and increased emphasis on independent study by young people. Clearly, the realization comes through that, if you de-emphasize classroom-centered and textbook-dominated instruction, the program of independent study must be heavily based upon excellent instructional materials support for the learning activities in which the young people are engaged.

The Dubuque, Iowa, Area Media Center sponsored a series of meetings to encourage desirable change in teacher behavior, based on the Far West Laboratory's Mini-Courses and Videotaping Techniques. Each of the mini-courses utilized Dr. Dwight Allen's micro-teaching technique and materials purchased with ESEA II funds.

The Cleveland, Ohio Special Purpose Grant provided funds for "paperback libraries" to support remedial reading programs within subject areas. To implement the project, the school district conducted a series of inservice meetings for teachers, aides, and media personnel in the area of reading methods. A vocal music teacher commented, "I am reviewing my lesson plans to see how I can add the reading techniques to them."

The Miller Elementary School in Cheyenne, Wyoming was remodeled utilizing the area formerly used as a gymnasium for an instructional resources area where collections of materials, many purchased with title II funds, are available to students throughout the day. This elementary program is considered exemplary by the Cheyenne District and test results show students are scoring far above the norm in reading comprehensive and vocabulary skills. Teachers are enthusiastic about their work and the student attitude is excellent.

In Alaska, $40,000 was set aside for special purpose grants to foster programs of innovative curricular and instructional techniques. High priority was given to projects emphasizing the early elementary grades. One school district coordinated ESEA title II, NDEA title III, and ESEA title I funds to establish listening centers in each classroom to provide teachers with activity stations for students who need supplemental or recreational learning experiences. The primary objective of the project is to improve reading and mathematics achievement by at least one year as measured by standardized tests. The target population is disadvantaged students in the elementary grades.

Many interesting instructional techniques have developed in California schools that are attempting to strengthen their programs through the advancement of media centers. Some have designed contracts with students; others have student production centers, still others employ unique methods of display and storage to encourage students to use unfamiliar materials. Many schools now allow students to check out projectors, viewers and cassette recorders along with the material so that these students can continue their work at home. One school has developed a program that calls for a media committee chaired by the vice principal in charge of instruction and consisting of all department heads, the media director, and two students. In order to make the committee even more effective, the vice principal has moved his office to the media center, and the department chairmen have their offices around the perimeter of the center.

Guam's school learning resources centers are all working toward vigorous programs using print and nonprint materials for the nongraded primary, some special classes, the bilingual program, team teaching in both elementary and secondary schools, accelerated and honor groups, modified programs for slow learners. All depend heavily on media collections, to which title II has been a substantial contributor. More student initiated activity is being encouraged. Through the use of independent study, they establish their own learning goals and have a greater role in determining what resources may be used to meet them. They are able to organize their own time and decide what standards will be used to determine when the goals have been reached.

ESEA title II funds have contributed in Nevada to curriculum development. An example is Nye County School District which provides materials for geographically and culturally isolated students, thereby allowing diversity in teaching and learning. Examples of title II support for projects stressing individual inquiry are a microform project in Washoe County, the multi-ethnic studies project in Clark County, and the reading improvement project in White Pine County.

(3) Use of Materials With Special Groups of Children

Children eligible to participate in the title II program are those who are enrolled in regular public and private elementary and secondary schools. Under the program, school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials have been made available to target groups of children according to their relative need for materials. The target groups include disadvantaged, gifted, handicapped, and bilingual children. Although

information on the number of such children served is not available, reports from State departments of education show a high degree of attention to the education needs of these children.

Delaware expended $35,250 of title II funds to acquire materials for children enrolled in the educational programs of five institutions: Alfred I. duPont Institute, the Governor Bacon Health Center, Hospital for the Mentally Retarded, Terry Children's Psychiatric Center, and the Department of Juvenile Corrections. Provision of library materials in these schools has stimulated the improvement of library facilities and employment of library staff.

Massachusetts funded title II projects in seven communities which are ranked as among the most economically distressed in the State. Over one-third of all the Massachusetts special-purpose grants are devoted to assisting either disadvantaged pupils or pupils with learning disabilities.

ESEA title II has supported educational programs in State institutions in Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia. The Kentucky School for the Deaf and Blind participates actively in the program. West Virginia revised its State plan in 1972 to assure funds for the School for Deaf and Blind, the Industrial School for Boys, the Industrial School for Girls, and the education programs operated by the Department of Mental Health.

Special schools as Kansas School for Hearing Impaired, Wisconsin Syble Hopp School for Mentally Retarded and the Crippled Children's School, Jamestown, North Dakota received support for instructional materials. Ohio was able to arrange for the Ohio Youth Commission to participate as a single entity (similar to a school district) for its seven or eight school programs.

In those States with concentrations of American Indians considerable effort was made to assist the school districts in acquiring quality materials on and by American Indians. Bibliographies, similar to that of Brainered, Minnesota, school district's, were compiled. The following quote from the Baraga Township School District, Michigan capsulizes efforts at the local effort, "Title II materials purchased for the use of High School students were in two areas--Indian Awareness and Career and Occupational Guidance. Because we have many students of Indian ancestry, the title II materials gave them an opportunity to acquire more information dealing with their heritage. Career and Occupational guidance title II materials were widely used by students from grades 7-12 increasing their awareness of new and obsolete careers. Materials in both areas were used extensively. Materials on Indian awareness were not only read by Indian students but also by students from other minority groups--such as Danish, Finnish, Lithuanian, Norwegian, Polish, etc. They probably acquired a deeper appreciation of the struggle for recognition and equality by Indians."

Despite allegations in recent news stories that ESEA II does not take into account the economic resources of a district, the States in the Upper Midwest use an economic index as well as a needs for materials factor in the relative need formulas. The greatest need for materials is usually found in schools with a lack of financial resources. Hence these two factors--low economic

index and few materials--assure that a greater portion of basic grants goes into schools with high concentrations of disadvantaged children.

North Dakota reported, "Reports and visitations indicate library resource materials do make an impact on improving instructional programs, as attested to by principals and teachers as well as media specialists. Title II is a part of that impact, which is often greatest on the disadvantaged children who have less access to materials outside of school experiences. Multimedia materials are often useful in motivating children with problems in reading, especially if the youngsters are allowed to use the materials themselves.

Wisconsin indicated, "We have a good deal of evidence from title II survey which indicates that title II is impacting its funds to schools where the largest number educationally and economically deprived students are enrolled."

In Colorado, title II has had an impact in improving programs for the economically disadvantaged children and has supported special bilingual programs in several small schools. One example is the Sierra Grand School, Costilla County, where a remedial reading and bilingual program have been assisted with title II funds.

All ESEA title II money allotted to the Bureau of Indian Affairs supports disadvantaged children who are an average of two years behind the national academic norms. The majority of these children are in bilingual programs in which their first exposure to English is upon their enrollment in school.

In American Samoa, also, almost all the children come to school with no English, so that programs in elementary schools are bilingual. Title II has provided picture books, easy to read and read aloud books to the early childhood programs. Special collections were sent by bookmobile to the correctional institutions and to the children's ward at the Tropical Medical Center.

A member of the Washington State Learning Resources team continues to serve as a liaison to a special department pupil services team, and to work closely with the four Special Education Instructional Materials Centers in the State. Department liaison with the Division of Institutions assure maximum title II support for the title I Institutions program.

(4) Use of Materials in Instruction in the Area of Social Issues

A number of interesting projects described in the fiscal year 1972 reports from State departments of education reveal the extent to which title II funds have been used to purchase materials used in the area of social problems. One particularly interesting project served senior high school girls attending Mary Imaculate Junior-Senior High School in Marlborough, Massachusetts. Teachers reported that their students showed a marked increase in motivation and interest in learning as a result of the "Activism and the Law" project. In fact, one student got so interested in the study of local politics that she returned to school after being absent without leave simply to vote for her candidate in the straw vote being held. This class produced a multimedia study on the Vietnam War which they have been asked to show in schools all over the State.

The title II coordinators in New York and Rhode Island also reported on several projects concerned with current social issues. Pupils enrolled at the Moses Brown School in Providence ended the school year with a summer seminar at Cape Cod featuring environmental studies in which instructional materials were used heavily for reference during field trips. Another Rhode Island project serving girls enrolled in St. Mary's Academy evaluated changes in pupil attitude toward their potential careers as a result of exposure to information about the roads open to women by the woman's liberation movement. In New York, $233,452 was expended on 14 projects concerned with drug abuse education and $269,949 for 14 projects in the field of environmental/ecological education.

In the field of social issues, Maryland reports that in one county the most exemplary use of ESEA title II funds in the area of developing social awareness has been through improvement of human relations. Toward this end, special materials in all forms of media have been gathered to cover the subject of Ethnic and Cultural Minorities. In studying and selecting materials, specialists have developed a concern for better human relations. The media itself has, ultimately helped in the discussion of problems and the development of answers and alternatives.

In another Maryland county, ESEA title II funds are used to purchase materials for the support of special programs in all the areas. The bilingual materials contributed to improve understanding of people of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Early childhood materials made those programs meaningful to students and provided resources for teachers to use in developing instructional activities.

In the field of social sciences in South Carolina, experience in the operation of the ESEA title II program shows improvement in setting up better prepared social studies objectives. As an example, greater emphasis is being placed on the updating and requisition of new materials to meet the societal personal needs of the students.

Library/Media Divisions of the Upper Midwest State departments of education and curriculum consultants in various subject areas as: social studies, health and physical education and special education prepared bibliographies, assisted local school personnel in selecting and using materials in drug education, traffic safety, sex education, consumer education and environmental education. Numerous bibliographies were prepared and distributed.

Media consultants of the Indiana Department of Public Instruction assisted in the four five-day drug abuse education seminars for training of 3-man school-community teams. Missouri media personnel cooperated with the Education Professions Development Section of the department in numerous workshops on drug abuse.

School libraries in Oklahoma have placed special emphasis on print and nonprint materials for drug abuse and environmental/ecological education.

Many of the materials purchased by Arizona school districts under title II have helped to make teachers more aware of stressing individualization and

responsibility through building a good self concept, which State staff believe leads to alcohol and drug abuse prevention. One of the Oregon Board of Education's priorities is Adding the Fourth "R" - Responsibility. This priority is to stress environmental education and drug abuse prevention, as well as civic affairs and local government. Schools have been encouraged to use title II funds to buy materials which support these priorities. Several title II special grants in Washington State are in the area of social issues. Examples are Man to Self, Man to Society, Society to Nature: Insight and Action in Intermediate School District 109, Teaching/Learning the Indian Way, an Environmental Multi-Media Approach in Cape Flattery School District 401, and Education for Better Human Relations in Walla Walla School District 140.

B. Development of Unified Media Programs

State department of education personnel reported that in fiscal year 1972, the title II program continued to be a significant factor in the development of unified media programs where a full range of printed and audiovisual materials is organized and made available for children and teachers.

The State school media consultant in Vermont reported:

> The philosophy of a unified media program has been generally accepted throughout the State. A boost toward full realization of the concept is the merger of the professional organizations into a combined educational media association including both school librarians and audiovisual specialists. We feel that the ESEA title II and NDEA title III programs have been very useful in stimulating this development.

The report from New York also notes progress in unified media programs:

> Most of the schools contain a centralized facility classified as a media center. Holdings in addition to books usually include periodicals, filmstrips, disc and tape recordings, and may include transparencies, slides, maps, globes, microforms, pictures, and/or study prints. Title II, through its State plan, made a significant impact by encouraging the acquisition of the full range of media and by requiring that all materials be cataloged and processed as part of a school media center. The effect has been to create greater accessibility by pupils and teachers to have resources in one-stop facilities. Almost all new plans for new or remodeled schools give high priority to school media centers that meet or exceed the minimum recommended space standards.

Both Alabama and Mississippi give credit to the advent of ESEA title II in developing a unified media concept, an impact which continues to be felt and accepted. Tennessee reports that the impact of ESEA title II in developing unified school media programs has been outstanding. In the past, the media program had been planned in terms of the basic philosophy of a unified media program but funds were too limited to make a great deal of progress. ESEA title II funds have enabled this philosophy to be implemented through the

provision of the materials necessary to carry out such a program. Other States, such as Florida which had unified school media programs where a full range of materials is organized and made available, testify to the fact that ESEA title II has had a definite impact on the program in that it provided funds to increase the quantity of materials. In some instances the ESEA title II effort has provided the impetus for establishing a definite budgeting structure for school media centers, since it has been able to present to school administrators a better understanding of the finances required for worthwhile media programs.

Ohio reported that the many requests for technical assistance and the loan of the filmstrip--record presentation on developing unified media programs showed real movement toward the unified approach. Illinois also concurred that the establishment of 267 school media centers and the expansion of 4,308 was a clear indication of ESEA II's impact in the development of unified media programs.

It was observed in Utah that as teachers gain confidence about moving into newer programs, they and their students are using equipment and materials with greater skill and effectiveness. Individualization of instruction with increasing student use of varied media is becoming more evident in schools over the State.

The media centers in schools are becoming more functional in the instructional program. Media staff and teachers are working more cooperatively in the selection and use of materials in the various subject areas.

Hawaii's schools were already enjoying the advantages of libraries, consisting mostly of books with a few filmstrips. Title II funds have enabled them to extend their collections with more audiovisual software, thus providing unified school media programs and resources.

Title II has had a significant impact in developing unified school media programs in Washington State. The proportion of nonprint materials acquired under the school library resources category of title II rose from 21 percent in 1966 to 60 percent in 1972. At the same time acquisitions of other instructional materials, principally audiovisual materials of various types, decreased from 10.4 percent of the total in 1966 to 4.1 percent in 1972, and acquisitions of school library resources rose from 86 percent of the total in 1966 to 92.8 percent in 1972.

Draft revised Oregon State standards require that each school shall have a unified media center which provides facilities and equipment for both individual and group experiences, the services of qualified media personnel, and instructional materials to enhance the learning process taking place in the total school program. Title II has encouraged the purchase of audiovisual as well as printed materials. This has necessitated a unified media center approach.

C. Introduction of New Types of Media

Since the beginning of the program, title II coordinators and media and subject specialists in State departments of education have called attention

to the various kinds of media which were not available to many elementary and secondary school children before 1965 but became available for the first time under title II. These have included paperback books and newer types of audiovisual materials such as transparencies, microforms, and 8mm film, as well as more traditional items such as maps, globes, and periodicals.

There are still in 1972 many schools without certain types of audiovisual and printed materials; however, in many schools these materials are becoming increasingly available. Delaware reports:

> Several school districts have reached the standard of 10 books per pupil and are attempting to bring their nonprint materials up to standard. Microforms are beginning to be used in greater quantities in secondary schools. There also appears to be an increasing number of elementary and junior high schools using microfiche.

The employment in Maine for the first time of a media specialist in the State Department of Education stimulated renewed interest in newer types of audiovisual materials in fiscal year 1972. About 36 percent of the amount spent for school library resources went for audiovisual materials.

Microform appears to be the new type of material that has been introduced into the schools for the first time. Virginia reports the use of microfiche books in elementary schools. Paperbacks on an effective scale have been introduced by ESEA title II to Alabama, Maryland, Mississippi, and West Virginia. In general, ESEA title II has been able to provide greater quantities of existing types of materials in all States; it has greatly augmented the use of audiovisual materials in the elementary schools; it has made it possible to concentrate funds on specific curriculum areas. In Tennessee the availability of ESEA title II funds has allowed the schools to purchase and utilize 8mm film loops, art prints, microform, and paperback books at a greatly accelerated rate.

North Dakota indicated, "Although we do not have data on first-time use of 8mm films, art prints, microforms, etc., these items are showing up on school media center inventories more frequently." The 205 Kansas secondary schools participating in the Kansas Vocational Information for Education and Work have access to information on occupation and training programs in Kansas available on microfiche.

Indiana, Michigan, Ohio and Wisconsin noted quantities of paperback books purchased. The Cleveland, Ohio paperback library project brought such responses from teachers as: "I have used the paperback books with my 8th grades and have found them excellent teaching materials, especially in motivating those students who don't usually do much outside reading."

The most frequently mentioned newer items in States of the Mid-Continent region being used by local schools are paperback books, art prints, 8mm films and microforms.

Utah administrators and media coordinators have been slow to acknowledge the strength of paperbacks but within fiscal year 1972 the request for paperback agencies have been frequent. Art prints have not been generally available in most schools but within the last two years many art reproductions have been purchased.

Emphasis on individualized learning and cuts in instructional materials budgets at the local level have resulted in significant increases in paperback collections throughout the schools in Washington State. This trend, first noted in fiscal year 1971 was again apparent in fiscal year 1972. Hawaii has also provided numbers of paperbacks to its schools through title II. The librarians in one of the largest public high schools in the State, located in Honolulu in an inner-city area, did a study to determine the popularity of paperbacks. Results of a student poll indicated that over 72 percent of the students preferred paperbacks over hard cover books. Additional reasons were given by the librarians for requesting additional title II funds to buy paperbacks. These reasons included the lower replacement cost of paperbacks; the smaller space requirements for shelving; the low initial cost of paperbacks which permits addition of new titles and of multiple copies of titles already in the collection, as needed.

Perhaps 75 percent of Hawaii's schools' first 8mm films, microfilms, and other types of audiovisual materials (except filmstrips) were purchased through ESEA title II. Nearly all California schools prior to title II received most of their audiovisual materials from their district offices or the county superintendent of schools' audiovisual center. The advent of title II caused school administrators and boards to recognize that materials closest to the student are the most valuable. The introduction of the cassette recorder and the 8mm loop projector have given great impetus to the addition of audiovisual materials at building levels.

A microform project was funded in Washoe County School District, Nevada, indicating that title II is responsible for the introduction of new media for the first time.

2. Procedures Used by State Departments of Education in Evaluating Title II and the Results

Evaluation plans for the special-purpose phase of the title II program in Massachusetts and Rhode Island were related specifically to goals and objectives stated in the projects selected for funding. Rhode Island reported the following results:

a. Of 13 projects, three - two in reading and one in science - reported gains in the achievement of project pupils over control pupils

b. Three schools reported no gains and the remaining schools either made no report or failed to complete the necessary testing

c. Additional planning for training local project directors should be carried out if further evaluation of this type is conducted.

Special projects in Massachusetts were funded only if projects had specific education objectives and stated means for achieving them. Reports from a number of these projects were appended to the 1972 report and in many cases, there is evidence of a dramatic relationship between media and the educational process. The following quotation is excerpted from a report entitled "Current Concern for Humanity" at the Acton-Bokborough Regional High School:

> The results of the questionnaires administered to our pupils reveal the success of the program and contain much more useful information. In the first place, with regard to the attitude poll, the results for ninth grade classes indicate increasingly positive reactions in almost all areas from the start of the program to its conclusion; the gains were generally greater among the participants (non-college classes) than the non-participants (college prep classes). The figures show that enjoyment of reading assigned books and of writing compositions increased among all 9th grade pupils and that negative feelings about themselves, e.g., that they were considered stupid, that they couldn't understand, and that English classes were boring, decreased particularly among non-college classes. While the proportion of college-prep students who preferred other subjects to English increased, the proportion of non-college students decreased. The results of the questionnaire filled out by English, history, and science teachers also indicated significant improvement in pupil attitude and behavior. In addition, the results of the questionnaire indicate the sources or cause of the program's success. The films used were shown to be the favorite type of media; books were second. Pupils clearly distinguished between reading certain books which they liked and those which they did not like. Teacher polls also showed development of teachers as a result of their exposure to and use of new media. Other teachers in the system were affected as there have been requests for the curriculum outline, lists of materials, loan of the materials used, lesson plans, and evaluation materials.

The State of Kentucky initiated in 1972 a study called The Use of Title II Funds in Kentucky School Libraries, 1965-71. The final report has not yet been submitted. Preliminary findings include:

54%+ of the schools report <u>much more</u> teacher interest in selection and classroom use of materials from the school media center since ESEA title II funds became available.

39%+ report more interest.

5%+ report no conspicious change.

Kentucky also comments that evaluative techniques relating to the ESEA title II program should become more sophisticated during the coming months with the establishment of the Office of Planning, Research, Evaluation and Dissemination in the Department of Education.

Florida, in its program operation and procedures document, lists specific program objectives which may be measured by formal reporting of findings during routine supervisory visits and by analysis of information from annual reports.

Puerto Rico reports the results of evaluative procedures used to measure the implementation and outcomes of the objectives formulated for the ESEA title II program for the last fiscal year. Based on data gathered and on on-site observations certain aspects of program operation were found to be in need of improvement:

a. Study and redefinition of formula to establish the relative need in the three areas of library resources, textbooks, and audiovisual materials.

b. Improvement of procedures for making materials available to children and teachers in all participating schools, especially the private schools.

c. Improvement in the communication with private schools. More direct communication has been established between title II General Supervisors at the Central Office and non-public school directors.

Also, a study of needs for textbooks was conducted. This study included textbooks in use, books needed as a result of curriculum revisions and increases in enrollment, workbooks and other consummable materials.

The School Library Program has initiated a study to determine the actual needs of children for library materials.

North Carolina, through the Education Professions Development Act, held two media institutes which should have bearing on future evaluative studies of media programs in the State. The institutes involved media specialists and their principals in a four-week inservice project. The media specialists and principals as teams worked on behaviorial objectives, studying selection materials and methods and producing transparencies and other non-print media. After the institutes ended, the teams returned to their respective local education agencies where each team conducted a 15-30 hour workshop for other teachers during the 1971-72 school year. The results of this experiment appear to be most beneficial.

A major evaluative procedure used by Indiana and Missouri was to evaluate State administration of ESEA II by assessing the extent to which the objectives for program administration were met. The following examples illustrate this procedure:

The Missouri title II, ESEA Section will provide consultative services on problems of library improvement, central elementary library development, library evaluation and local administration of title II, ESEA projects through visitations to 35 school districts in fiscal year 1972.

(1) Activities to achieve this objective:

a. Visits have been planned, scheduled and made in accordance with time available for professional personnel.

b. Follow-up letters have been provided unless other means were taken to provide the required information for the benefit of the school personnel, on problems under consideration.

Local school districts in Wisconsin participated in a third assessment of the progress made in centralizing collections, expending local monies for materials, staff and facilities and for meeting standards. Some of the results since 1968 were:

An increase of 6% of elementary schools with centralized facilities for use by 3% more students. (32% of elementary students or 172,000 attend schools without centralized libraries)

Local expenditures for materials increased from $5.8 million to $7.4 million or 27%

25% of senior high schools had a per pupil expenditure for books at or above minimum level (Standards for School Library/Media Programs 1972-75 for the latest revisions); 17% of the junior high schools and 12% of the elementary schools met Standards for expenditures for books.

Staff shortages were revealed as 67 in senior high schools; 99 in junior high schools; 171 in elementary schools for a total of 337.

Doctoral dissertations in Iowa and Kansas and several masters' theses were based on evaluations of ESEA II. The Iowa study, Perceptions of Classroom Teachers Concerning Instructional Media and Services Provided by Regional Educational Media Centers in Iowa, in general, showed that the teachers and children were pleased with the materials, inservice programs and delivery of materials provided by the regional centers.

Indiana produced lists of attendance centers without media centers, lists of attendance centers without media centers, but with available space, a comparison study of local education statistics reported for previous three fiscal years and a report of expenditures in materials accounts for 305 local education agencies.

The Evaluation Division of the Oklahoma State Department of Education has devised a performance inventory for each Federal program which allows the local educational agencies to evaluate themselves.

The title II part of the evaluation instrument follows:

School Library Resources
Title II ESEA
P.L. 89-10

PLEASE CHECK ONE (Position of the person completing this questionnaire):

☐ Central Office Administrator ☐ Principal ☐ Media Specialist ☐ Teacher ☐ Parent ☐ Student

INSTRUCTIONS: The following scale is designed to measure how well the title II ESEA program is meeting its objectives and fulfilling its role in the overall educational program. Please read each statement, then check the point on the scale indicating the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Title II ESEA has greatly increased the amount of library media materials in our school.						
2. Without title II ESEA funds we could not maintain the material in our library media center at desired levels.						
3. Because of title II ESEA funds we have added a great deal of audiovisual material to our library media center.						
4. Because of the additional materials we have been able to secure with title II funds, our library media center is much more widely used by students.						
5. Because of the additional materials we have been able to secure with title II funds, our library media center is used a great deal more by teachers.						
6. The added resource material in our library media center has had a favorable effect on school attendance.						
7. The added material in our library resources center that title II ESEA has provided has contributed to the raising of pupil achievement.						
8. Because of the added number of new books in our media center, our students are reading more books.						
9. We have been able to add many high interest, low vocabulary books with title II funds.						
10. The materials added to our media center with title II funds include up-to-date information on educational and occupational guidance.						
11. Individualized instruction has been stimulated because of the increased amount of instructional materials purchased with title II funds.						
12. Students who have seldom used the library media center before have been attracted by the abundance of new title II materials.						
13. The increased amount of title II materials in our media center has led to a closer cooperation between the library media staff and the classroom teachers.						
14. Title II materials in our library media center enable us to meet the curriculum needs in our school to the extent that we are doing a better job for our girls and boys.						

In addition to this form, much evaluative information is gained from an annual joint statistical report devised by the State Department of Education which gathers much statistical information regarding all of the Federal programs participated in by the local education agencies.

Work was begun on a document to assess the improvement in California education as a direct result of ESEA title II. The evaluation will be completed and published in fiscal year 1973. The State also set up in fiscal year 1972 a series of Program and Operational Procedures for the ESEA title II program. The primary goal was to improve the quality and effectiveness of instruction in California by providing local educational agencies and related groups: professional leadership, coordination, and technical assistance in planning, installing, operating and evaluating instructional media programs within the State utilizing title II funds. In order to attain the primary goal, six sub-goals were identified:

a. To provide statewide coordination and professional leadership in the systematic development, installation and operation of media programs within the State

b. To develop, install, and implement evaluation techniques designed to determine the effectiveness of operational and proposed media centers

c. To provide professional leadership in the development, installation and operation of pre-service and inservice training activities designed to improve the quality and effectiveness of media selection and classroom utilization

d. To collect and disseminate information to local education agencies, nonpublic schools, and related organizations regarding the relative value to be attained through the adoption of technological innovations

e. To prepare periodic management reports and change recommendations, submit them to proper authorities, and plan future actions based upon communication and feedback

f. To develop, install and operate ideological and/or technological liaison between educational agencies and related groups

A series of activities, stated in measurable terms, was then developed to reach each sub-goal. Inability to complete 100 percent of all activities was due in each case to a reduction in staff.

Washington State set four goals for its title II program in 1972:

a. Increase the numbers and varieties of materials available to small school districts through increased participation of such districts in the title II program.

b. Increase integration of all Federal funding sources concerned with the effective use of learning resources, equipment, staff and facilities, both within the schools of the State and within the department.

c. Provide through use of title II funds, model elementary and secondary learning resources demonstration centers throughout the State, to demonstrate effective use of media.

d. Improve programs that depend upon the effective use of relevant and adequate learning materials.

Each of these goals was effected in part or whole through two or more specific actions or activities.

3. Dissemination Activities

Title II coordinators have used a number of techniques to disseminate information about the title II program to school administrators, school board members, and to the educational community and general public. Delaware, Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont reported that information was disseminated to local educational agencies and the private sector through conferences, inservice programs, and bulletins of information. Delaware produced an attractive pamphlet Protect Your Right to Read - Improve Your School Library which contained information about title II and was widely distributed to parents. Massachusetts distributed information on their evaluative study conducted in fiscal year 1971. Massachusetts and Pennsylvania also developed multimedia presentations on title II which described the use of media in instructional programs and used them extensively at conferences attended by school personnel and lay groups. During fiscal year 1972, the Rhode Island Department of Education continued to issue its excellent newsletter, Media News, which provided information on professional activities, trends, new instructional materials, and developments related to school media programs.

Connecticut and Massachusetts have made use of television to disseminate information about title II and school media programs. Title II staff in Connecticut presented a one hour program on public television in which the objective of the special small reading grants was described and fundamental information about application procedures and criteria used for selection of projects was presented. The second half of the program used the telephone call-in technique in which teachers asked questions regarding the various elements of the program and received answers from the panel of consultants. The entire program was videotaped and repeated on four separate occasions during the year.

In the States of the Southeast, publicity concerning the special grants continued to be the most striking and attention getting kind of information disseminated. Slide-tape descriptive presentations, illustrated brochures and newspaper articles were the most common forms used. General information about ESEA title II was disseminated by other traditional methods which included conferences (State, regional and local), correspondence,

displays, meetings with district coordinators, magazine and newspaper articles, memoranda, newsletters, reports, speaking to civic and community groups, State Office of Public Information releases, telephone calls, radio and television programs. For example, Puerto Rico reports that:

1. Written information was provided to each public and non-public school eligible for ESEA title II.

2. A newsletter was published by the Audiovisual Program. It contains a section with the latest materials received by the resource centers and film libraries.

3. Data gathered by the Office of External Resources on distribution of ESEA title II funds in each program (textbook, library and audiovisual) to public and non-public schools was presented for discussion to General Supervisors in each of the Regions.

Illinois produced a 16mm film, "Beyond the Book" which describes four school media programs; Iowa, a filmstrip on the regional center concept and slide-tapes and video tapes on individual area media centers and their services for presentation to the community-at-large.

One librarian in the North Adams Public Schools in Michigan got the word out:

> I have used each chance opportunity to inform about title II whenever the conversation has drifted, or been directed, toward book interest. Some varied occasions have been: Great Books Discussion group, Tri-County Retired Persons Association, Friends of the Library Association, Michigan Library Associations, parents who have asked about the school funding, donors who give memorial gifts, teachers in the system--personally and in group meetings.

In those Upper Midwest States with State Right-to-Read Committees, the ESEA II coordinator is a member of the committee, and the chairman of this committee is a member of the ESEA II State Advisory Committee or Task Force. With this exchange of personnel dissemination of information to both groups and to the respective constituents has been effective.

The news releases in local papers about special purpose grants to support the Right-to-Read created a great deal of interest locally.

Congressmen and State legislators have welcomed the information abstracts about ESEA II which the State departments of education have prepared.

The following quote from the Iowa report indicates acceptance to such a degree that State legislation to provide other services on a regional or area basis is being studied:

A more favorable to very favorable attitude toward the ESEA title II program seems to prevail all over Iowa at this time. As the program of services in each of the sixteen media centers grow and the public relation efforts gain momentum, more and more school administrators, teachers and others give their support and praise to the regional approach or concept.

Obviously, the most support and favorable reaction comes from the educational communities where teachers and students are receiving and have access to an abundant and wide variety of quality instructional resources.

Many will agree that there are quite a number of good things going on in the regional media centers throughout the State. Our task seems to be to capitalize on those good things and make them available in all of our media centers through out the State. Satisfied school administrators and teachers and a climate for possible new legislative action at the State level may make it possible to obtain an abundant and wide variety of quality instructional resources for all teachers and students in all sixteen regional media centers in Iowa.

The regional media center approach using ESEA title II funds to make school library resources available for teachers and students in the elementary and secondary schools in Iowa is receiving more support and gaining in overall acceptance.

Finally, Michigan summarizes the Hamilton Community Schools' reaction to ESEA II. "One parent commenting on our combined federally funded programs made this statement - 'My child is a changed boy. He picks up books, reads signs, etc. when he never did before. I think this has changed his whole outlook on life (for the best) and what more can a mother say?"

A variety of dissemination activities were utilized by States of the Mid-Continent region to inform school and community people of title II programs, procedures and accomplishments. Newsletters, memos to school officials, conferences, news releases, slide and transparencies, and television programs were all used by one or more States. Publicity given special incentive grants supporting reading was reported by over half the States in the Mid-Continent region.

The relationship of the title II program and the Right to Read effort in Texas was interpreted to the educational community and to the general public through a thirty minute television program as one facet of the awareness and dissemination activities for both title II and Right to Read. Another effort was the development and use of a slide presentation with script to describe the role of the library in support of and in conjunction with each of the Right to Read goals. Examples of local education agency programs were used to illustrate library activities to achieve the various goals.

Arrangements were made by the Arizona ESEA title II director for the Governor to issue a proclamation during Children's Book Week. The Indian

Oasis School District was invited to send 15 students to hear the Governor read the proclamation. They met with him, and one of the students told the Governor about the School's Right to Read project which involved a take home program including equipment as well as materials. Funding came from NDEA title III and ESEA title II. The informal meeting was a highlight for these students from the Papago Indian community. The title II Director arranged for a local bank to take the students to lunch at a local resort. Photographs were taken and appeared in several newspapers.

The California State title II supervisory staff continued to explore ways of disseminating information about the program to influential groups among educators and communities. One outstandingly successful endeavor involved collaboration with the docents of the Santa Barbara Museum of Art in a weekend workshop devoted to the theme of mythology as expressed both in printed and in art forms. The connection with the State Parent-Teachers Association has been continued and strengthened. Through a staff member's liaison with the International Sister City Association, an impact on school libraries in Mexico has been made. Visits by students and teachers from Mexican cities heightened the pride of California schools in their title II funded materials and brought about legislation in Mexico to develop school libraries in Mexican schools.

In American Samoa, Flag Day is a major holiday. A float was used in the 1972 Flag Day parade to publicize the title II program and won a prize. It was in the form of the island bookmobile with children reading books from other countries. Information about the Bethel, Alaska Air Bookmobile (a Bureau of Indian Affairs ESEA title II and III project) was disseminated to the State Library and media professionals via workshop sessions and through a one-half hour tape recording describing the program. The tape was also transmitted via radio.

VI. Needs

In spite of the progress made under title II, there are still great needs for instructional materials for use in every subject and in every grade in elementary and secondary schools. There is also need for professional materials for teachers, and for additional school media personnel to assist with the selection, acquisition, organization, and use of materials.

1. Critical Needs for Materials

Although title II has made a substantial contribution to increased quantities of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials, local and State school personnel report continued and critical needs for more materials. These needs are chiefly for two reasons. First, the introduction of new teaching techniques has created increased demand for high quality learning materials. Further, the needs for new materials are continuing, both because the explosion of knowledge and the fact that materials become outworn and obsolete.

Following are statements indicating the most critical needs for instructional materials by grade level, subject area, and type of material in several States:

Connecticut- Teachers and media specialists involved in projects in oceanography, intergroup relations, early childhood education, drug education, music mathematics, and ecology have experienced problems in having quality materials in these areas. A survey of Connecticut schools shows that 82 percent have no films, 68 percent no 8mm films, and 45 percent no slides.

Vermont- The greatest need for media is in elementary schools (k-6), all subject areas, and especially for new audiovisual materials.

New Jersey- Needs assessment studies indicate that school media collections are still far below standard recommendations for quality collections. There is special need for materials that deal with the black experience. Elementary schools are still far below secondary schools in the amount and variety of media available.

The needs for materials expressed by six Southeastern States - Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia - are described by the following statement:

"There still exists a shortage of all types of materials at all levels. Many libraries are still holding out-dated, worn, and inappropriate materials. With the emphasis being placed on research-type teaching and individualization of instruction, more materials, as well as a greater variety of types, are needed."

Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee all state that the need is greatest in the area of audiovisual materials. While Alabama has only this year reached the level of 5.5 books per child and is striving for a much higher average, a balance of non-book materials is needed for the developing multi-media approach. North Carolina cites four critical need areas:

1. A wide range of media to implement the concept of a comprehensive school media collection. Additional film, filmstrips, disc, tape and cassette recordings, transparencies, 8mm film loops, art prints, microfilm, periodicals and newspapers are needed to expand all areas of instruction for groups and individuals.

2. Additional professional materials for teacher use.

3. Resources to support the Right to Read effort.

4. Support media to meet the State and Federal emphases on career education, drug abuse, ecology, early childhood programs, reading programs, and programs for the culturally disadvantaged.

Maryland sees the middle school as the level of greatest need, chiefly because the redistricting of school systems has only recently created many of these schools.

Specific area needs singled out are materials for drug education, career education, ecology, early childhood programs, and easy materials for older students. Virginia no longer uses a textbook for the required study of the history of the State, and so materials in this area will be increasingly important. South Carolina states that an abundance of paperback books would contribute greatly to the achievement of their goal of reducing drop-outs and failures. Puerto Rico alone lists new textbooks as a pressing need, particularly at the elementary level. In the field of library resources, Puerto Rico desperately needs non-print materials for primary grades.

Throughout the Upper Midwest, the elementary schools have the greatest need for quantities of quality materials to meet the demands of such practices as open schools, individualized instruction, and independent study, and for recreational interests. According to the Michigan assessment of fourth and seventh grades, reading and communication skills needed the most strengthening--hence a need for materials for the non-reader audio-visual materials or "high-interest low vocabulary" books.

Other areas needing materials are early childhood programs, vocational and career education, humanities with emphasis on American Indian, Mexican-American and Afro-American studies, and drug abuse education.

Captioned films and disc recordings for the partially-sighted in regular classrooms and paperback books are among the critical needs according to format.

Several States of the Mid-Continent region have surveys under way to document with hard data the types of media on hand and the amounts and types needed in the districts of their State. Specific areas of need reported include materials for career education, bilingual education, print and especially non-print materials to support individualized instruction.

Needs for additional materials, both print and non-print, in order to individualize instruction were cited as of highest priority in Alaska, California, and Washington State. Audiovisual materials of all kinds are badly needed in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools, especially at the elementary school level, and in Oregon. The continuing need in Hawaii for non-print materials can be measured by the fact that in fiscal year 1972, 91 percent of the project applications requested audiovisual materials.

In American Samoa, materials in the Samoan language on local culture, customs, and history are an urgent need to support courses planned for fiscal year 1973. Materials produced in Micronesia for Micronesian students still hold highest priority in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The Headquarters Education Library Services section for example, has recently reproduced the Micronesian Reporter on microfilm in an attempt to provide one such set of materials. Distribution of this valuable resource to school libraries that can use it may be made possible through future ESEA title II funds. Multi-ethnic materials lead the list of those most needed in California, and multi-media kits for Indian and Mexican children who are learning English as a second language are an urgent need in Arizona schools.

Materials of all kinds to support reading programs recently introduced into Arizona high schools, as well as those in elementary schools, are required in order to help implement the State Board of Education's policy on reading proficiency required for high school graduation. Forty-eight percent of the title II requests for materials in Hawaii showed needs in the curriculum area of English language arts (including reading). In Washington State, the need for materials for improving reading ranks next highest to individualized instruction. A Statewide needs assessment program in Nevada identified the areas of basic skills as the most pressing educational need. Media center resources are required to assist in the development of basic skills. Subject matter areas still holding priority of need in Oregon are reading, science, mathematics, and social studies.

Stress placed on career and vocational education in Oregon and Arizona cause a high index of need for supporting materials.

Additional needs for large quantities of newer, unique, and more sophisticated materials were cited in Oregon:

a. Interesting and easy to understand materials for beginners, slow learners, and children with handicaps that impede the learning process;

b. Materials to support new and greater emphasis now being placed on economics, political science, local government, and international relations;

c. More and newer instructional materials for psychology, sex education, drugs and narcotics abuse prevention;

d. Materials of all kinds to support the new curriculums in computer technology, oceanography, the cultural heritage of minority groups, moral and ethical values.

2. Manpower Needs

Title II administrative funds have made a substantial contribution to State school media programs through the provision of administrative and supervisory staff in State departments of education. There is still, however, a shortage of staff to carry out sound State programs of leadership in media activities. Maine, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island are among States that are currently without the services of a school library specialists; Vermont is in need of an audiovisual specialist. Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania have both school library specialists and audiovisual specialists employed in the State education agencies; however, they need additional staff to provide increased services.

Although reports from State departments of education indicate the employment of significant numbers of school media personnel in school district central offices and local schools in fiscal year 1972, the need for media personnel is still evident. The media manpower problems in two States are shown below:

Delaware- Thirteen of the 23 school districts in the State do not have school media or library coordinators. Of these, at least 11 are of adequate size to support a media coordinator. Within the last year, there has been a slight decrease in the number of librarians employed in local schools, chiefly because of school financial problems. There has been an increase in the number of aids employed but the loss of professional services is discouraging.

New York- Budgetary crises have caused severe cutbacks in elementary school media personnel. The detrimental effect of these cutbacks on the educational program is already in evidence.

All twelve Southeastern States reported under greatest local needs qualified media personnel at the building level. Alabama needs 800 media specialists for its developing elementary school media program. To meet national standards for personnel Florida would require 3,500 additional positions. In Mississippi, although only 177 of the 632 elementary schools have no media personnel, only one third of these schools are served by certified media staff members.

South Carolina reports as its greatest manpower need, district level supervisors for media programs. In Maryland only 11 of the 24 school districts have media supervisory personnel; in Mississippi only 26 of 150 local districts are served by media supervisors. Puerto Rico needs film librarians for its regional film centers to promote and assist in the schools, as well as technicians to maintain the film libraries.

At the State level, North Carolina, to improve the quality and increase the availability of instructional materials, the following services are needed:

1. Additional professional staff members to assist local school personnel in strengthening competencies in selection, evaluation, acquisition and effective utilization of a comprehensive unified media collection, including materials acquired under title II.

2. Staff to provide assistance in disseminating information to Federal, State and local agencies on media programs; to conduct intensive surveys and statistical analyses of the impact of the title II program in the State, including both relative need and Project Media grants.

3. Staff to provide additional examination centers strategically located throughout the State with services similar to those in the Materials Review Evaluation Section of the Division of Educational Media.

Maryland needs additional State supervisory staff to work specifically in regions where there is no local media supervision, to work with ethnic and

cultural minority materials, and to assist local schools to more effectively plan and operate comprehensive unified media programs. Virginia has two established State supervisory positions unfilled, and has created a third to direct the new Materials Examination Center which is a special title II project. Puerto Rico has an urgent need for clerical and purchase personnel to cope with demands of correct preparation of requisitions and related purchase problems.

All States reported need for clerical assistance at all levels.

Every Upper Midwest State indicated a need for additional staff at the State level to provide technical assistance to local districts and to do adequate long range planning for a State-wide school media program. Minnesota indicated that the present State staff has to spread its services too thinly. District supervisors in every State are needed, as shown by the projection in Indiana for 32 additional supervisors. Professional personnel at the building level is the greatest need in both "rural and urban" States. Some cutback in professional personnel was noted in Michigan because of budget problems.

All States of the Mid-Continent region report the need for more manpower at all levels. The most critical need is in the elementary area where personnel with library training are needed but not even required or encouraged by all States. Even where funds are available, not enough trained librarians can be found. Quantitative statements from Texas reveal a need for over one hundred library media supervisors and over two thousand school librarians. Rural schools with an enrollment of less than five hundred, generally do not have services from any trained librarian.

Alaska needs a full-time media and library consultant in the State agency to work on program development, to assess district needs for materials, to help develop State standards, and to do evaluation. The loss of two consultants at the State level in California left the title II program short of personnel and forced neglect in monitoring basic grants. It was also necessary to modify supervision of special purpose grants as had been planned. Arizona is also understaffed at the State level with one professional and a secretary, who also function as the staff of the Library Media Services, and a bookkeeper who devotes one-half time to title II.

Most of the larger urban school districts of Arizona employ both a library and audiovisual coordinator; others employ one or the other to serve in both capacities. In a number of districts, one librarian serves as the district librarian in addition to functioning as librarian for one of the schools in the district.

School district administrators and boards of education seem to be concerned about meeting quantitative standards for materials and equipment, but are reluctant to provide funds for adequate staff to administer the programs. Cutbacks in district budgets in California have caused the loss of some district and building level library personnel. The State has less than one-third of the librarians required to meet adopted standards.

Media center personnel are needed throughout Nevada in schools enrolling K-8. Even though the library media centers in Oregon's small schools have made progress in establishing facilities, there are still large numbers of these schools which have not as yet succeeded. It is due mainly to lack of sufficient funds at the district level and inability to procure qualified and competent personnel. Although these little schools make up the largest portion of district not participating in title II, their enrollment makes up less than 8 percent of all students in grades K-12.

Media staff in isolated elementary schools administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs is almost nonexistent. Needs of the children and teachers in these schools could be met in part through regional school libraries which serve the surrounding small day schools. There are now three: Bethel, Alaska; Santa Rose, Arizona; and Pine Ridge, South Dakota. The situation in Alaska's public schools is very similar. Some of the smaller schools have the services of either a part-time person in the library, or more often, no one is available, even though a few of the larger local educational agencies have full-time library media personnel. Secondary schools in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands lack sufficient trained personnel, and those that do have training need additional training. Librarianship at the elementary level, with few exceptions, is yet to develop. This is a need Territory staff are trying to address by instituting appropriate courses at the Micronesian Community College.

Tables 1-8

Table 1. Funds Available and Funds Expended for Acquisition and State Administration and Percent of Total Expended for Administration Under ESEA Title II, By State or Outlying Area, Fiscal Year 1972

State or Outlying Area	Allotment	Acquisitions	State Administration	Total Expenditures	Percent Expenditures for State Administration	Percent of Allotment Expended	Carryover
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	$90,000,000	$78,286,154	$3,217,294	$81,502,428	3.95	90.55	$8,496,572
Alabama	1,460,724	1,387,803	69,076	1,456,879	4.74	99.74	3,845
Alaska	135,215	118,612	14,641	133,253	10.99	98.55	1,962
Arizona	768,689	560,440	-0-	560,440	72.91	0.00	208,249
Arkansas	807,949	701,019	37,110	738,129	5.03	91.36	69,820
California	8,564,292	7,985,284	264,869	8,250,153	3.21	96.33	314,139
Colorado	990,955	940,667	41,404	982,071	4.22	99.10	8,884
Connecticut	1,300,672	1,213,530	41,019	1,254,549	3.27	96.45	46,123
Delaware	255,228	205,228	39,910	245,138	16.28	96.05	10,090
Florida	2,554,308	1,444,820	79,478	1,524,298	5.21	59.68	1,030,010
Georgia	1,949,172	1,857,053	28,286	1,885,339	1.50	96.73	63,833
Hawaii	352,543	301,233	34,823	336,056	10.36	95.32	16,487
Idaho	321,960	271,597	37,443	309,040	11.63	95.99	12,920
Illinois	4,830,114	4,148,648	108,627	4,257,275	2.55	88.14	572,839
Indiana	2,311,952	2,196,366	43,466	2,239,832	1.94	96.88	72,120
Iowa	1,285,267	1,224,064	61,203	1,285,267	4.76	100.00	-0-
Kansas	966,108	887,454	38,938	926,392	4.20	95.88	39,716
Kentucky	1,348,968	1,287,968	61,000	1,348,968	4.52	100.00	-0-
Louisiana	1,681,489	1,584,024	3,214	1,587,238	0.20	94.39	94,251
Maine	460,371	403,179	29,262	432,441	7.26	93.93	27,930
*Maryland	1,740,544	1,548,429	61,596	1,610,025	3.82	92.50	130,519
Massachusetts	2,364,332	2,246,115	102,518	2,348,633	4.37	99.34	15,699
Michigan	4,252,744	4,050,232	148,149	4,198,381	3 53	98.72	54,363
Minnesota	1,814,858	1,749,632	16,574	1,766,206	0.94	97.34	48,652
Mississippi	1,017,833	659,441	49,661	708,102	7.00	69.67	308,731
Missouri	2,115,431	2,058,494	14,057	2,072,551	0.68	97.97	42,880
Montana	328,651	-0-	33,296	33,296	100.00	10.13	295,355
Nebraska	658,196	371,465	66,933	438,398	15.27	66.61	219,798
Nevada	218,942	193,294	18,501	211,795	8.74	96.74	7,147
New Hampshire	316,168	139,949	32,232	172,181	18.72	54.46	143,987
New Jersey	2,993,829	2,682,333	84,381	2,766,714	3.08	92.41	227,115
New Mexico	510,703	467,137	21,617	488,754	4.42	95.70	21,949
New York	7,408,582	7,038,153	220,138	7,258,291	3.03	97.97	150,291
North Carolina	2,063,424	1,737,433	63,503	1,800,936	3.53	87.28	262,488
North Dakota	282,965	231,077	19,746	250,823	7.87	88.64	32,142
Ohio	4,737,404	4,508,139	138,878	4,647,017	2.99	98.09	90,387
Oklahoma	1,076,331	984,981	88,924	1,073,905	8.28	99.77	2,426
Oregon	874,006	823,605	50,000	873,605	5.72	99.95	401
Pennsylvania	4,896,472	4,630,529	218,943	4,849,472	4.51	99.04	47,000
Rhode Island	386,997	354,725	31,868	386,593	8.24	99.90	404
South Carolina	1,134,518	1,038,786	41,874	1,080,660	3.87	95.25	53,858
South Dakota	313,952	261,074	29,734	290,808	10.22	92.63	23,144
Tennessee	1,580,795	1,492,641	34,385	1,527,026	2.25	96.60	53,769
Texas	4,960,462	4,712,439	231,471	4,943,910	4.68	99.67	16,552
Utah	527,142	471,451	46,750	518,201	9.02	98.30	8,941
Vermont	197,886	173,610	22,785	196,395	11.60	99.25	1,491
Virginia	1,940,673	339,913	25,417	365,330	6.96	18.82	1,575,343
Washington	1,495,705	1,431,955	60,688	1,492,643	4.07	99.80	3,062
West Virginia	709,655	10,011	24,441	34,452	70.94	4.85	675,203
Wisconsin	2,094,174	1,687,170	53,378	1,740,548	3.07	83.11	353,626
Wyoming	154,056	122,949	27,998	150,947	18.55	97.98	3,109
American Samoa	30,000	28,425	690	29,115	2.37	97.05	885
Trust Territory	83,812	79,083	1,124	80,207	1.40	95.70	3,605
*District of Columbia	291,472	226,800	35,674	262,474	13.59	90.05	28,998
Guam	67,596	56,387	7,775	64,142	12.12	94.89	3,454
Puerto Rico	1,841,850	794,867	50,403	845,270	9.96	45.89	996,580
Virgin Islands	38,850	38,461	389	38,850	1.00	100.00	-0-
Bureau of Indian Affairs	133,014	126,000	7,014	133,014	5.27	100.00	-0-

*Estimated

Table 2. Funds Available and Funds Expended for State Administration and for Acquisitions Under ESEA Title II Programs: Fiscal Years 1966-71

Fiscal Year	Allotment	Administration		Acquisitions		Total Expenditure (Col. 3 & 5)	Percent of Allotment Expended
		Amount	Percent	Amount 1/	Percent		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1966	$100,000,000	$ 1,984,158	2.0	$ 95,298,079	98.0	$ 97,282,237	97.3
1967	102,000,000	3,812,688	3.8	95,745,032	96.2	99,557,720	97.6
1968	99,234,000	4,428,073	4.5	94,024,821	95.5	98,452,894	99.2
1969	50,000,000	3,035,422	6.2	46,153,184	93.8	49,188,606	98.4
1970	42,500,000	2,386,828	6.4	34,913,640	93.6	37,300,468	87.8 2/
1971	80,000,000	3,281,932	4.1	67,343,321	95.9	70,625,253	95.9
1972	90,000,000	3,217,274	3.9	78,286,154	96.1	81,503,428	90.5 2/
Total	$563,734,000	$22,146,375	4.1	$511,764,231	95.9	$533,910,606	94.7

1/ Includes expenditures for ordering, processing, cataloging, and delivering

2/ A statutory amendment permitted carryover to the next year of unexpended funds.

Table 3. Cost of State Administration Under ESEA Title II, by Object of Expenditure and State or Outlying Area, Fiscal Year 1972

State or Outlying Area	Salaries	Contracted Services	Equipment	Other Expenses	Indirect Costs	Funds Transferred To Local Educational Agencies	Grand Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	$2,311,092	$69,501	$42,312	$592,069	$124,945	$77,325	$3,217,274
Alabama	51,412	-0-	32	17,632	-0-	-0-	69,076
Alaska	14,227	-0-	-0-	414	-0-	-0-	14,641
Arizona	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Arkansas	27,401	473	136	9,100	-0-	-0-	37,110
California	211,599	-0-	-0-	17,942	35,328	-0-	264,869
Colorado	31,343	3,751	440	5,870	-0-	-0-	41,404
Connecticut	27,639	-0-	-0-	12,178	1,202	-0-	41,019
Delaware	22,552	1,670	-0-	8,504	-0-	7,184	39,910
Florida	78,241	-0-	-0-	1,237	-0-	-0-	79,478
Georgia	23,937	-0-	286	4,063	-0-	-0-	28,286
Hawaii	21,677	-0-	734	12,412	-0-	-0-	34,823
Idaho	27,518	-0-	83	9,842	-0-	-0-	37,443
*Illinois	98,256	7	19	10,315	-0-	-0-	108,627
Indiana	22,732	474	-0-	16,858	-0-	3,402	43,466
Iowa	36,172	1,500	800	13,551	-0-	9,180	61,203
Kansas	26,554	-0-	577	11,807	-0-	-0-	38,938
Kentucky	51,890	-0-	300	8,810	-0-	-0-	61,000
Louisiana	1,119	-0-	2,095	-0-	-0-	-0-	3,214
Maine	11,116	1,200	6,780	10,166	-0-	-0-	29,262
*Maryland	48,987	245	-0-	12,364	-0-	-0-	61,596
Massachusetts	67,297	4,052	402	30,767	-0-	-0-	102,518
Michigan	75,763	-0-	321	38,610	-0-	33,455	148,149
Minnesota	9,467	979	1,432	4,696	-0-	-0-	16,574
Mississippi	26,726	-0-	2,144	20,791	-0-	-0-	49,661
Missouri	5,628	-0-	-0-	438	-0-	7,991	14,057
Montana	17,072	128	2,072	14,024	-0-	-0-	33,292
Nebraska	46,869	4,758	1,024	14,282	-0-	-0-	66,933
Nevada	8,045	-0-	578	1,001	8,877	-0-	18,501
New Hampshire	23,267	-0-	1,096	7,869	-0-	-0-	32,232
New Jersey	67,879	-0-	208	16,294	-0-	-0-	84,381
New Mexico	16,535	1,811	656	2,615	-0-	-0-	21,617
New York	207,177	8,068	-0-	4,893	-0-	-0-	220,138
North Carolina	31,281	9,116	1,190	15,516	-0-	6,400	63,503
North Dakota	12,921	2,400	-0-	2,690	-0-	1,735	19,746
Ohio	106,197	12,885	1,306	18,490	-0-	-0-	138,878
Oklahoma	57,237	162	586	19,504	11,435	-0-	88,924
Oregon	32,722	-0-	-0-	6,824	5,509	4,945	50,000
Pennsylvania	154,195	1,830	1,250	61,668	-0-	-0-	218,943
Rhode Island	24,225	1,063	1,664	4,916	-0-	-0-	31,868
South Carolina	37,075	-0-	-0-	4,799	-0-	-0-	41,874
South Dakota	22,999	72	255	6,408	-0-	-0-	29,734
Tennessee	26,291	5,304	450	2,340	-0-	-0-	34,385
Texas	138,471	2,254	1,082	30,538	59,126	-0-	231,471
Utah	34,940	-0-	398	11,012	-0-	400	46,750
Vermont	18,478	165	4,142	-0-	-0-	-0-	22,785
Virginia	21,557	-0-	1,630	2,230	-0-	-0-	25,417
Washington	45,920	4,534	923	7,799	-0-	1,512	60,688
West Virginia	16,597	-0-	1,042	6,802	-0-	-0-	24,441
Wisconsin	34,045	600	968	16,644	-0-	1,121	53,378
Wyoming	20,678	-0-	-0-	3,852	3,468	-0-	27,998
American Samoa	-0-	-0-	-0-	690	-0-	-0-	690
Trust Territory	-0-	-0-	-0-	1,124	-0-	-0-	1,124
*District of Columbia	23,507	-0-	3,067	9,100	-0-	-0-	35,674
Guam	1,275	-0-	-0-	6,500	-0-	-0-	7,775
Puerto Rico	44,384	-0-	144	5,875	-0-	-0-	50,403
Virgin Islands	-0-	-0-	-0-	389	-0-	-0-	389
Bureau of Indian Affairs	-0-	-0-	-0-	7,014	-0-	-0-	7,014

*Estimated

Table 4. Number of State Department of Education Personnel Assigned to ESEA Title II in Fulltime Equivalents, Fiscal Year 1972, by State or Outlying Area

State or Outlying Area	Administrators	Supervisors	Secretarial and Clerical	Other	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	62.29	69.96	168.14	14.15	314.54
Alabama	0.6	1.4	3.0	1.0	6.0
Alaska	0.22	0.22	0.53	0.0	0.97
Arizona	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Arkansas	1.19	0.23	1.46	0.58	3.46
California	1.0	7.0	10.2	1.0	19.2
Colorado	0.5	1.0	1.2	0.0	2.7
Connecticut	1.0	0.0	2.0	1.0	4.0
Delaware	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0
Florida	2.0	1.85	1.75	0.0	5.60
Georgia	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	4.0
Hawaii	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	4.0
Idaho	0.5	1.0	1.5	0.0	3.0
*Illinois	4.2	7.7	14.6	0.0	26.5
Indiana	4.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	5.0
Iowa	1.0	1.2	2.0	0.0	5.2
Kansas	0.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	3.0
Kentucky	1.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	6.0
Louisiana	0.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	3.0
Maine	1.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	4.0
*Maryland	0.0	2.5	1.5	0.0	4.0
Massachusetts	1.0	3.0	4.0	1.1	9.1
Michigan	1.0	5.0	2.0	0.0	8.0
Minnesota	0.5	1.0	3.5	0.5	5.5
Mississippi	0.0	1.0	1.5	0.5	3.0
Missouri	1.3	1.0	2.3	0.0	4.6
Montana	0.8	0.0	1.3	0.0	2.1
Nebraska	2.0	1.0	2.2	0.3	5.5
Nevada	0.25	0.0	0.5	0.0	.75
New Hampshire	2.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	3.1
New Jersey	0.0	1.0	10.5	0.0	11.5
New Mexico	1.25	0.0	2.75	0.0	4.0
New York	6.0	1.0	11.0	1.0	19.0
North Carolina	1.25	0.0	5.0	0.0	6.25
North Dakota	1.08	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.08
Ohio	1.20	3.0	3.5	0.0	7.70
Oklahoma	2.1	1.0	3.4	0.0	6.5
Oregon	1.0	0.25	0.0	0.50	1.75
Pennsylvania	1.0	2.0	6.0	1.0	10.0
Rhode Island	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.04	2.04
South Carolina	0.0	2.0	4.0	0.0	6.0
South Dakota	0.0	3.0	1.5	0.0	4.5
Tennessee	0.0	3.0	1.0	0.0	4.0
Texas	8.5	0.0	10.1	0.0	18.6
Utah	0.5	1.0	2.5	0.8	4.8
Vermont	0.2	1.0	1.0	0.2	2.4
Virginia	0.5	1.0	1.0	0.0	2.5
Washington	0.4	1.3	1.0	0.7	3.4
West Virginia	1.0	0.0	2.0	1.0	4.0
Wisconsin	1.0	1.0	4.0	0.5	6.5
Wyoming	0.1	1.0	1.1	0.0	2.2
American Samoa	0.20	0.66	1.0	0.33	2.19
Trust Territory	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.0	1.0
*District of Columbia	1.0	3.0	2.0	0.0	6.0
Guam	0.5	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.5
*Puerto Rico	1.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	4.0
*Virgin Islands	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Bureau of Indian Affairs	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.10	0.85

*Estimated

Table 5. Cost of School Library Resources, Other Instructional Materials, and Textbooks Loaned to Children and Teachers; Costs of Ordering, Cataloging, Processing, and Delivering Materials, and Percent of Total Acquisitions Expended in Each Category; Under ESEA Title II, Fiscal Year 1972

State or Outlying Area	School Library Resources		Other Instructional Materials		Textbooks		Ordering, Processing, Cataloging, and Delivering		Total Acquisitions
	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	$69,946,321	89.35	$4,400,649	5.62	$726,135	0.92	$3,213,049	4.11	$78,286,154
Alabama	1,241,298	89.44	84,963	6.12	19,912	1.44	41,630	3.00	1,387,803
Alaska	109,570	92.38	-0-	0.00	5,487	4.62	3,555	3.00	118,612
Arizona	544,032	97.07	16,408	2.93	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	560,440
Arkansas	701,019	100.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	701,019
California	7,045,842	88.24	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	939,442	11.76	7,985,284
Colorado	634,605	67.46	235,877	25.08	-0-	0.00	70,185	7.46	940,667
Connecticut	1,208,630	99.60	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	4,900	0.40	1,213,530
Delaware	193,315	94.20	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	11,913	5.80	205,228
Florida	1,373,177	95.04	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	71,643	4.96	1,444,820
Georgia	1,734,263	93.39	-0-	0.00	20,698	1.11	102,092	5.50	1,857,053
Hawaii	269,370	89.42	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	31,863	10.58	301,233
Idaho	203,868	75.06	61,062	22.48	-0-	0.00	6,667	2.46	271,597
Illinois	3,990,674	96.2	129,526	3.1	-0-	0.00	28,448	0.7	4,148,648
Indiana	1,998,776	91.00	64,920	2.96	-0-	0.00	132,670	6.04	2,196,366
Iowa	1,151,875	94.10	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	72,189	5.90	1,224,064
Kansas	851,633	95.96	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	35,821	4.04	887,454
Kentucky	1,126,009	87.43	39,054	3.03	80,239	6.24	42,576	3.30	1,287,968
Louisiana	1,519,350	95.92	-0-	0.00	14,489	0.91	50,185	3.17	1,584,024
Maine	369,004	91.52	26,480	6.57	-0-	0.00	7,695	1.91	403,179
*Maryland	1,189,884	76.84	304,378	19.66	1,057	0.07	53,110	3.43	1,548,429
Massachusetts	2,144,595	95.48	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	101,520	4.52	2,246,115
Michigan	3,765,097	92.96	81,814	2.02	101,256	2.50	102,065	2.52	4,050,232
Minnesota	1,690,145	96.60	31,493	1.80	-0-	0.00	27,994	1.60	1,749,632
Mississippi	621,855	94.30	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	37,586	5.70	659,441
Missouri	1,973,386	95.87	-0-	0.00	9,215	0.45	75,893	3.68	2,058,494
Montana	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Nebraska	354,039	95.31	2,961	0.80	-0-	0.00	14,465	3.89	371,465
Nevada	185,559	96.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	7,736	4.00	193,465
New Hampshire	120,320	85.97	12,828	9.17	445	0.32	6,356	4.54	139,949
New Jersey	2,635,117	98.24	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	47,216	1.76	2,682,333
New Mexico	313,542	67.12	85,299	18.26	53,534	11.46	14,762	3.16	467,137
New York	6,380,728	90.66	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	657,425	9.34	7,038,153
North Carolina	1,715,606	98.74	246	0.02	50	0.00	21,531	1.24	1,737,433
North Dakota	231,077	100.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	231,077
Ohio	4,408,624	97.79	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	99,515	2.21	4,508,139
Oklahoma	974,918	98.96	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	10,063	1.04	984,981
Oregon	823,605	100.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	823,605
Pennsylvania	2,433,188	52.55	2,127,885	45.95	69,456	1.50	-0-	0.00	4,630,529
Rhode Island	331,455	93.44	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	23,270	6.56	354,725
South Carolina	860,800	82.86	118,283	11.39	-0-	0.00	59,703	5.75	1,038,786
South Dakota	255,642	97.92	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	5,432	2.08	261,074
Tennessee	1,412,020	94.60	-0-	0.00	34,201	2.29	46,420	3.11	1,492,641
Texas	4,658,246	98.85	-0-	0.00	30,631	0.65	23,562	0.50	4,712,439
Utah	460,364	97.65	-0-	0.00	11,087	2.35	-0-	0.00	471,451
Vermont	173,610	100.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	173,610
Virginia	334,749	98.48	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	5,164	1.52	339,913
Washington	1,328,834	92.80	44,366	3.10	-0-	0.00	58,755	4.10	1,431,955
West Virginia	10,011	100.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	10,011
Wisconsin	1,016,681	60.26	623,460	36.95	30,846	1.83	16,183	0.96	1,687,170
Wyoming	117,643	95.68	3,690	3.00	54	0.05	1,562	1.27	122,949
American Samoa	28,425	100.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	28,425
Trust Territory	34,875	44.11	20,788	26.21	18,377	23.24	5,043	6.37	79,083
District of Columbia	226,800		-0-		-0-		-0-		226,800
Guam	56,137	100.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	56,367
Puerto Rico	277,444		255,168		225,011		37,244		794,867
Virgin Islands	38,461	100.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	38,461
Bureau of Indian Affairs	96,300	76.43	29,700	23.57	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	126,000

*Estimated

Table 6. Cost of Library Books, Periodicals, Other Printed Materials, and Audiovisual Materials Loaned to Children and Teachers as School Library Resources, Under ESEA Title II, Fiscal Year 1972, and Percent of Total for Each Type of Material, by State or Outlying Area

State or Outlying Area	Books		Periodicals		Other Printed Materials		Audiovisual Materials		Total Acquisitions
	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	$39,327,423	56.23	$861,195	1.23	$1,286,866	1.84	$28,470,837	40.70	$69,946,321
Alabama	773,844	62.35	34,084	2.75	26,143	2.10	407,227	32.80	1,241,298
Alaska	27,496	25.09	7,436	6.79	18,379	16.78	56,259	51.34	109,570
Arizona	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	215,808	39.67	328,224	60.33	544,032
Arkansas	657,782	93.84	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	43,237	6.16	701,019
California	3,752,468	53.26	202,581	2.87	23,289	0.33	3,067,504	43.54	7,045,842
Colorado	322,370	50.80	2,093	0.33	-0-	0.00	310,142	48.87	634,605
Connecticut	540,177	44.69	34,497	2.86	-0-	0.00	633,956	52.45	1,208,630
Delaware	94,152	48.70	3,700	1.91	4,093	2.12	91,370	47.27	193,315
Florida	693,354	50.49	9,460	0.69	7,198	0.52	663,165	48.30	1,373,177
Georgia	1,654,410	95.40	6,509	0.37	109	0.01	73,235	4.22	1,734,263
Hawaii	67,768	25.16	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	201,602	74.84	269,370
Idaho	128,288	62.93	4,971	2.44	15,331	7.52	55,278	27.11	203,868
*Illinois	1,982,098	49.67	72,465	1.82	51,238	1.28	1,884,873	47.23	3,990,674
Indiana	992,981	49.68	13,440	0.67	45,776	2.29	946,579	47.36	1,998,674
Iowa	266,752	23.16	40,411	3.51	-0-	0.00	844,712	73.33	1,151,875
Kansas	300,895	35.31	2,452	0.29	2,965	0.35	545,321	64.05	851,633
Kentucky	712,745	63.30	13,970	1.24	2,643	0.23	396,651	35.23	1,126,009
Louisiana	1,475,790	97.13	43,560	2.87	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	1,519,350
Maine	230,153	62.37	3,973	1.08	1,583	0.43	133,295	36.12	369,004
*Maryland	559,973	47.07	1,585	0.13	53,070	4.45	575,256	48.35	1,189,884
Massachusetts	979,170	45.66	21,118	0.98	81,728	3.81	1,062,579	49.55	2,144,595
Michigan	1,810,454	48.09	29,162	0.77	44,148	1.17	1,881,333	49.97	3,765,097
Minnesota	1,011,288	59.83	-0-	0.00	8,748	0.52	670,109	39.65	1,690,145
Mississippi	520,841	83.76	-0-	0.00	101,014	16.24	-0-	0.00	621,855
Missouri	1,321,134	66.95	9,883	0.50	46,115	2.34	596,254	30.21	1,973,386
Montana	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	-0-
Nebraska	182,638	51.59	3,039	0.86	19,634	5.54	148,728	42.01	354,039
Nevada	29,290	15.79	785	0.42	9,318	5.07	146,165	78.77	185,558
New Hampshire	120,320	100.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	120,320
New Jersey	816,907	31.00	44,186	1.68	-0-	0.00	1,774,024	67.32	2,635,117
New Mexico	207,269	66.11	1,401	0.45	1,635	0.52	103,237	32.92	313,542
New York	2,833,644	44.41	63,508	0.99	117,918	1.85	3,365,658	52.75	6,380,728
North Carolina	816,801	47.61	13,470	0.79	16,695	0.97	868,640	50.63	1,715,606
North Dakota	155,929	67.48	1,113	0.48	3,235	1.40	70,800	30.64	231,077
Ohio	2,749,956	62.38	38,362	0.87	86,022	1.95	1,534,284	34.80	4,408,624
Oklahoma	668,242	68.54	19,300	1.98	58,125	5.96	229,251	25.52	974,918
Oregon	322,284	39.13	5,050	0.61	4,383	0.53	491,888	59.73	823,605
Pennsylvania	2,427,714	99.77	-0-	0.00	1,192	0.05	4,282	0.18	2,433,188
Rhode Island	128,419	38.74	3,865	1.17	456	0.14	198,715	59.95	331,455
South Carolina	614,638	71.40	13,273	1.54	-0-	0.00	232,889	27.06	860,800
South Dakota	135,747	53.10	3,622	1.42	-0-	0.00	116,273	45.48	255,642
Tennessee	993,411	70.35	-0-	0.00	45,691	3.24	372,918	26.41	1,412,020
Texas	3,501,813	75.17	30,631	0.66	24,034	0.52	1,101,768	23.65	4,658,246
Utah	121,789	26.46	16,814	3.65	-0-	0.00	321,761	69.89	460,364
*Vermont	103,567	69.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	46,437	31.00	150,004
Virginia	194,279	58.04	5,001	1.49	2,029	0.61	133,440	39.86	334,749
Washington	477,114	35.90	10,100	0.76	98,950	7.45	742,670	55.89	1,328,834
West Virginia	4,287	42.82	-0-	0.00	40	0.40	5,684	56.78	10,011
Wisconsin	243,715	23.97	2,007	0.20	41,383	4.07	729,576	71.76	1,016,681
Wyoming	64,693	54.99	1,096	0.93	3,451	2.93	48,403	41.15	117,643
American Samoa	28,425	100.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	28,425
Trust Territory	24,603	70.55	2,873	8.24	297	0.85	7,102	20.36	34,875
*District of Columbia	113,670	50.12	168	0.07	-0-	0.00	112,962	49.81	226,800
Guam	56,367	100.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	56,367
Puerto Rico	190,062	68.51	19,361	6.98	-0-	0.00	68,021	24.51	277,444
*Virgin Islands	19,230	49.99	-0-	0.00	-0-	0.00	19,231	50.01	38,461
Bureau of Indian Affairs	57,780	60.00	4,820	5.00	3,000	3.12	30,700	31.88	96,300

*Estimated

Table 7. Cost of Trade Books, Periodicals, Other Printed Materials, and Audiovisual Materials Loaned to Children and Teachers as Other Instructional Materials Under ESEA Title II, Fiscal Year 1972, and Percent of Total for Each Type of Material, by State or Outlying Area

State or Outlying Area	Books		Periodicals		Other Printed Materials		Audiovisual Materials		Total Acquisitions
	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	$1,931,513	43.89	$24,909	0.57	$201,753	4.58	$2,242,474	50.96	$4,400,649
Alabama	65,376	76.95	849	1.00	4,215	4.96	14,523	17.09	84,963
Alaska	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Arizona	-0-	-	-0-	-	12,165	74.14	4,243	25.86	16,408
Arkansas	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
California	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Colorado	107,595	45.62	5,288	2.24	-0-	-	122,994	52.14	235,877
Connecticut	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Delaware	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Florida	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Georgia	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Hawaii	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Idaho	26,892	44.04	1,191	1.95	12,795	20.95	20,184	33.06	61,062
Illinois	36,352	28.1	4,064	3.1	12,509	9.7	76,601	59.1	129,526
Indiana	32,376	49.87	185	0.29	2,054	3.16	30,305	46.68	64,920
Iowa	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Kansas	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Kentucky	20,698	53.00	414	1.06	1,054	2.70	16,888	43.24	39,054
Louisiana	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Maine	15,445	58.33	40	0.15	-0-	-	10,995	41.52	26,480
*Maryland	103,841	34.12	83	0.03	240	0.08	200,214	65.77	304,378
Massachusetts	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Michigan	54,678	66.83	2,025	2.48	810	0.99	24,301	39.70	81,814
Minnesota	5,249	16.67	-0-	-	-0-	-	26,244	83.33	31,493
Mississippi	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Missouri	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Montana	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Nebraska	1,705	57.58	-0-	-	149	5.03	1,107	37.39	2,961
Nevada	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
New Hampshire	12,828	100.00	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	12,828
New Jersey	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
New Mexico	27,514	32.26	981	1.15	4,251	4.98	52,553	61.61	85,299
New York	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
North Carolina	148	60.16	-0-	-	98	39.84	-0-	-	246
North Dakota	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Ohio	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Oklahoma	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Oregon	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Pennsylvania	1,203,913	56.58	2,850	0.13	11,148	0.52	909,975	42.77	2,127,885
Rhode Island	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
South Carolina	15,611	13.20	228	0.19	86,898	73.47	15,546	13.14	118,283
South Dakota	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Tennessee	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Texas	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Utah	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Vermont	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Virginia	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Washington	12,174	27.44	881	1.99	1,677	3.78	29,634	66.79	44,366
West Virginia	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Wisconsin	103,947	26.30	3,546	0.57	48,388	7.76	407,579	65.37	623,460
Wyoming	544	14.74	-0-	-	864	23.42	2,282	61.84	3,690
American Samoa	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Trust Territory	6,808	32.75	284	1.36	438	2.11	13,258	63.78	20,788
*District of Columbia	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Guam	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Puerto Rico	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	255,168	-	255,168
*Virgin Islands	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-	-	-0-
Bureau of Indian Affairs	17,820	60.00	2,000	6.73	2,000	6.73	7,880	26.54	29,700

*Estimated

Table 8. Funds Expended for Trade Books, Periodicals and Other Printed Materials, Textbooks, and Audiovisual Materials Under ESEA Title II, Fiscal Year 1966-72

Fiscal Year	Expenditures								Total
	Trade Books		Periodicals and Other Printed Materials		Textbooks		Audiovisual Materials		
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1966	$ 64,018,074	74.70	$ 2,220,933	2.59	$ 2,959,485	3.45	$ 16,499,187	19.26	$ 85,697,679
1967	62,649,447	69.91	2,407,239	2.69	3,108,949	3.47	21,446,013	23.93	89,611,648
1968	59,267,160	67.38	2,003,083	2.28	2,174,495	2.47	24,507,227	27.86	87,951,965
1969	29,163,307	65.22	1,603,154	3.59	1,638,314	3.66	12,307,660	27.53	44,712,435
1970	22,297,268	65.51	1,559,503	4.58	244,157	.72	9,931,837	29.19	34,032,765
1971	38,347,071	59.26	1,652,594	2.55	1,076,007	1.66	23,637,176	36.53	64,712,848
1972	41,258,936	54.96	2,374,723	3.16	726,135	0.97	30,713,311	40.91	75,073,105
Total	$317,001,263	65.80	$13,821,229	2.87	$11,927,542	2.47	$139,042,411	28.86	$481,792,445